FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 205 23 October 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gorbachev 22 Oct Address on Reykjavik Outcome AA 1
Bovin Explains Objections, Alternatives to SDI [IZVESTIYA 22 Oct] AA 10
Chernyshev Discusses Proposed Arms Curb 'Package' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Oct] AA 13
Velikhov Argues Case for Nuclear Test Ban [NEW TIMES 13 Oct] AA 15
UN Envoy Extols Verification for Arms Control AA 18
Burlatskiy: USSR's Reykjavik Efforts 'Not in Vain' [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 15 Oct] AA 19
L. Ponomarev Faults U.S. 'Distortion' of ABM Treaty AA 22
NATO Commander Voices Fears on INF Removal [Krivopalov in IZVESTIYA 22 Oct] AA 23
Nuclear-Space Talks Groups Meet in Geneva AA 24
    Space Weapons Group AA 24
    Strategic Arms Group AA 24

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

AUCCTU's Shalayev Addresses World TU Congress [TRUD 18 Sep] CC 1
Gorbachev Reykjavik News Conference UN Document CC 3

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gerasimov Announces Steps To 'Balance' Expulsions A 1
U.S. Expulsions 'Deliberate Step' To Worsen Ties A 3
Further on U.S. 'Propaganda' Efforts on Reykjavik A 4
    Kornilov Counters 'Lies' A 4
    PRAVDA Hits Perle, Buchanan [Kuznetsov, 19 Oct] A 6
Kohl's U.S. Discussions on Reykjavik Not 'Easy' [Mnatsakanov] A 8
    Ignatyev on SDI Stance A 8

CHINA

IZVESTIYA Cites PRC Reaction to Reykjavik [Savenkov, 21 Oct] B 1
Aid to PRC in Transmission Line Construction B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Continued Reportage of Kim Il-song Moscow Visit C 1
  Greeted by Gromyko, Officials C 1
  Welcomed by Gorbachev C 1
  Visits National Monuments C 1
Radio Commentary Hails Soviet-DPRK Friendship C 2
Moscow Warns Japan Not To Distort World War II [Afonin] C 3
Briefs: Tokyo Space Symposium C 4

EASTERN EUROPE

Polish Paper Interviews Ryzhkov in Warsaw [Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU 16 Oct] F 1
PRAVDA Carries Honecker Greetings to Leaders [19 Oct] F 5
Honecker Stops in Irkutsk on Way to DPRK [East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 30 Oct] F 6
Soviet Ambassador Receives U.S. Envoy to FRG [ADN] F 6

WESTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Visit of Denmark's Schluter G 1
  Schluter Kremlin Dinner Speech G 1
  Schluter on Reykjavik Talks G 1
  'Sharp' Talks on Human Rights [AFP] G 2
  TASS Cites Danish Press Agency G 3
  Schluter Leaves for Tbilisi G 4
Gromyko Discusses Reykjavik With Visiting Swiss G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Envoy to UAE Comments on Soviet Arms to Iraq [Kuwait KUNA] H 1
PRAVDA Reports on 'Terrorist' Wailing Wall Attack [17 Oct] H 1

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Gorbachev, Others Sign Machel Condolence Book J 1
PRAVDA Carries Declaration With Burkina Faso [14 Oct] J 1
Dobrynin Receives Tanzanian Ambassador [PRAVDA 19 Oct] J 5
Dobrynin Receives Ethiopian Ambassador J 5

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Ships Arrive on Official Visit to Cuba K 1
Brutents Ends Visit to Panama 5 October [PRAVDA 6 Oct] K 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Moscow Worker Executed for Espionage for U.S. R 1

Yeltsin Address to Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Oct] R 1
Further Report [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Oct] R 9
'Inaccuracies' Corrected [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Oct] R 10
Supreme Soviet Presidium To Convene 17 Nov R 11

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Text of CSA Report on 9-Month Plan Fulfillment [PRAVDA 18 Oct] S 1

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

PRAVDA Reviews Harvest, Livestock Situation [Yevgenyev, 9 Oct] T 1
Agricultural Developments for 19-21 Reported T 2
Briefs: Azerbaydzhan Cotton Harvest T 3

GORBACHEV 22 OCT ADDRESS ON REYKJAVIK OUTCOME

LD222054 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" program; speech to the nation by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, from Moscow on 22 October -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Video shows Gorbachev sitting in studio] Good evening, dear comrades! I am once again meeting with you and once again it's on the same issue -- Reykjavik. This is an extremely serious matter; the outcome of the meeting with the U.S. President has aroused the whole world.

In the previous days much new information requiring assessment has appeared; information which I would like to share with you tonight. You remember I said at the press conference in Reykjavik that we will return more than once to the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. I am sure that we are not yet aware of the whole importance of what happened. But we will definitely come to understand it. If not now, then tommorrow we will understand the entire significance of Reykjavik and give both the achievements and gains, as well as the missed chances and the losses, their due.

For all the drama of both the progress of the talks and their results, the meeting in Reykjavik -- perhaps for the first time in many decades -- advanced us so far in our search for ways toward nuclear disarmament.

I think even now that is a result of the meeting we have become elevated to a higher level not only in the analysis of the situation, but also in defining the aims and the framework of possible accords [dogovorennosti] on nuclear disarmament. Having been a few steps away from a practical accord on such a difficult and vitally important problem, we have all begun to understand infinitely more the danger in which the world finds itself, and we feel more strongly the necessity for urgent decisions and, what is most important, we now know that elimination of the nuclear threat is realistic and possible.

I would like to note here that even quite recently the Soviet program for liquidating nuclear weapons by the year 2000 was declared by many pillars of world politics to be illusion and an unrealizable dream. Here, indeed, is that very case when past experience is neither wealth nor a counsellor but a burden hampering a search for solutions.

But Reykjavik not only gave rise to hope; Reykjavik also highlighted the difficulties on the path to a nuclear-free world. The results of the Iceland meeting cannot be properly assessed without an understanding of this fact. The forces opposed to the tendency toward disarmament are great. We felt this at the meeting itself, and now. There is much talk about Reykjavik now. The meeting in Iceland is viewed by realistically thinking people as a major political event. The fact that as a result of it we have managed to reach new qualitative levels in the struggle against nuclear weapons is welcome. The results of Reykjavik, as they appear to the Soviet leadership, encourage all those who want a change for the better. Interesting assessments are being expressed in state, public, and scientific circles in the majority of countries. The possibilities that have taken shape are described as responding to the aspirations of all mankind. In the general view, the meeting raised to a new level the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, just as it did the East-West dialogue as a whole.

It was brought out of the plane of technical computations and numercial comparisons and on to new parameters and dimensions. From this height can be seen new prospects in solving those problems which face us so acutely today. I have in mind security, nuclear disarmament, the prevention of new spirals of the arms race and a new understanding of the opportunities which have opened out before mankind.

It may be said that the worldwide debate on the results of the meeting is still only developing. I believe -- more than that, I am convinced -- that it will grow. We believe that the common efforts of the peoples and of political and public circles, directed toward realizing the opportunities which were opened up at the meeting in Reykjavik, will also grow. It was there that was signposted -- I would put it this way -- a route to move toward a solution to some of the most important problems on which mankind's very destiny depends.

But the period since Reykjavik has shown something else, too. The circles connected with militarism, with the profits from the arms race, are evidently alarmed. They are striving with all their might to cope with the new situation, and by coordinating their actions, are striving in every way to confuse people, to take control of the moods of broad circles of the world's public, extinguish their enthusiasm for peace and to prevent governments from adopting a clear stance at this crucial moment in history. These circles have at their disposal political power, economic levers, and powerful information media. One should not, of course, overestimate their strength, but neither should one underestimate it. To all appearances it will be a tough struggle.

A fresh regrouping of forces has started among the opponents of detente and disarmament. Feverish efforts are being made to set up obstacles so that the progress started in Reykjavik will become bogged down. In these conditions, I consider it necessary to return to the issues which have come to be acute ones on the agenda in connection with the meeting in Iceland. Our point of view, which I expressed 1 hour after it ended, has not changed. I consider it necessary to speak about this not only in order to reaffirm the assessment previously made. I am doing it in order to draw your attention to the chopping and changing [chekharda] dissonance that we are observing, whether they be the result of confusion and bewilderment, or whether they be actions thought out in advance in order to swindle ordinary people.

Various explanations of the objectives set before the meeting are current. From the initial curses directed toward Reykjavik they have rapidly and simultaneously gone into talk of triumph. A noisy campaign has begun to appropriate proposals made by others, and the main forces have been directed in defense of SDI, which was disgraced in Reykjavik. In sum, there is a great deal of bustle in Washington at the moment.

Is this a pre-election game which needs success in Reykjavik? Or are we faced with an unpredictable policy for the forthcoming years?

This phenomenon requires serious study. It has not escaped our attention how and where certain political circles are trying to direct the discussion of the outcome of the meeting. It is worth speaking about the chief aspects of such a campaign. They would like to whitewash the destructive position of the U.S. Administration, which came to the meeting unprepared, and I would say again, with their old baggage.

And when there was no escaping it and the situation demanded clear answers, the administration wrecked the possibility of concluding the meeting with accords. They want to coerce the USSR, in the new situation which has come about following Reykjavik, to return to the old approach, to draw it back to fruitless discussions of numbers, to wandering in a circle in a deadlocked situation.

It is evident that there are not a few of this kind of politician in the West whom the talks in Geneva suit as a screen rather than as a forum for seeking accords. What was previously carefully masked is now becoming clearer.

There are powerful forces in the American and West European ruling circles which are striving to wreck the process of nuclear disarmament. Some people have again begun to assert that nuclear arms are almost a blessing. It is said that half-truths are the most dangerous kind of lies. And it is very alarming that this position -- sometimes it is one of pure deceit -- has been taken up not only by the right-wing mass media, but also by highly placed figures in the U.S. Administration.

I have already had the opportunity to say what happened at Reykjavik. We arrived for the meeting with constructive proposals, the most radical in the history of Soviet-U.S. talks, for arms reductions. They take account of the interests of both sides. Having arrived in Iceland, I talked about this on the eve of the meeting in a conversation with that country's leaders, and in the middle of the first conversation with the U.S. President, these proposals were handed to him. Far-reaching and inter-related, they form a complete package, and they are based on our program announced on 15 January, for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

First: Reduce by half all strategic weapons without exception.

Second: Completely eliminate Soviet and U.S. intermediate-range missiles in Europe and embark immediately on talks on missiles of that type in Asia, as well as on missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km, the numbers of which we proposed to freeze immediately.

Third: Consolidate the ABM regime and begin full-scale talks on the total banning of nuclear tests.

It was on the basis of the Soviet proposals that discussions began in Reykjavik -- of which I spoke in detail in my earlier addresses.

As a result of difficult struggle and keen arguements, an encourageing drawing together of the positions on two of the three directions took place. The logic of the talks led the sides to determine specific dates for the elimination of strategic offensive weapons.

President Ronald Reagan and I came to agreement that such armaments of the USSR and the United States can and should be completely liquidated by 1996. An accord was also reached on the complete liquidation of the U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, and a radical reduction in that class of missiles in Asia.

We attach principle importance to these accords between the USSR and the United States. They have shown that nuclear disarmament is possible. That is the first half of the truth about Reykjavik.

But there is another half as well. It lies in the fact, as I have already said, that the U.S. side wrecked the agreement which seemed just a stone's throw away.

The U.S. Administration is now trying as hard as it can to convince everyone that a possible major success leading to specific agreements was not achieved because of the unyielding attitude of the Soviet side over the program of the so-called strategic Defense Initiative. They are even saying that we lured the President into a trap by putting forward breathtaking proposals on reducing strategic offensive armaments and medium-range missiles, and then, they are saying, we demanded in the form of an ultimatum that they reject SDI.

But the essence of our position and our proposals is this: We are in favor of a reduction, and then the complete liquidation, of nuclear weapons, and we are resolutely opposed to a new stage in the arms race and transferring it to outer space. Hence we are against SDI and for strengthening the ABM Treaty.

Every sensible person understands that it we embark upon the road of profound reductions, and then complete elimination, of nuclear weapons, we have to exclude any possibility that could be used either by the Soviet or by the U.S. side to achieve unilateral military superiority. We see the main danger of the SDI as an attempt to extend the arms race into a new sphere, the desire to move into space with offensive weapons, and thus to achieve military superiority. SDI stands in the way of ending the arms race, and getting rid of nuclear weapons; it is the main obstacle on the road to a nonnuclear world, and when Mr Shultz, the U.S. secretary of state, tell the American people that SDI is a kind of insurance policy for the United States, this is, at least, an attempt to mislead the American people.

In fact, SDI does not strengthen the United States' security. It does not strengthen it. By opening a fresh stage in the arms race it destabilizes the military-political situation and thereby weakens both the security of the United States and general security too. The American must know this. They must also know that the U.S. position on SDI, which was announced in Reykjavik, is fundamentally at variance with the ABM Treaty. Article 15 of the treaty does indeed let one depart from the treaty but only under definite circumstances -- namely, if extraordinary circumstances pose a threat to the supreme interests of the participants in the treaty. No such circumstances have existed nor do they exist now. It is clear that the elimination of nuclear weapons, were it to start, would render the occurrence of such extraordinary circumstances even less likely. It is logical.

Article 13 of the ABM Treaty makes provision for something else--namely, that the sides must consider, as it becomes necessary, possible proposals to further enhance the viability of the existing treaty. The United States is actually striving for the reverse: to devalue the treaty, to deprive it of meaning. These are all quotations from the document signed by the supreme representative of the United States.

They have made up a lot of fables to raise the prestige of SDI. One of them is that the Russians are terribly afraid of it. Another is that it was SDI that brought the Russians to the Geneva talks and then to Reykjavik. The third is that SDI is American's only salvation from the Soviet threat. The fourth is that SDI will give the United States a big technological advance on the Soviet Union and other countries, and so on and so forth.

Now, knowing what the problem is, I can only say one thing: Continuation of the SDI will draw the world into a new stage of the arms race and destabilize the strategic situation. Everything else that is ascribed to SDI is largely extremely dubious and is being done to sell this suspicious and dangerous commodity in attractive packaging.

The President, in defending his position which led to the wrecking of an accord in Reykjavik, asks rhetorical questions: Why are the Russians demanding so insistently that the United States remain eternally vulnerable to a Soviet missile strike? Why does the Soviet Union insist that we should be left eternally defenseless?

I confess I am surprised by such questions. They seem to imply that the U.S. President has the ability to make his country invulnerable, to reliably defend it from a nuclear strike. But as long as nuclear arms exist and the arms race continues, he has no such ability. Nor, of course, have we. If the President is here counting on SDI, it is in vain. The system will be effective only if all missiles are liquidated. But why, then, one may ask, is antimissile defense needed at all? Why build it?

I still have not mentioned the resources scattered to the winds, the cost of this system. According to some estimates it will reach several trillion dollars. For the time being, we are striving, trying to persuade the United States to abandon its dangerous venture. We are trying to persuade the U.S. Administration to seek invulnerability, protection, on another path, the path of totally scrapping nuclear weapons and the creation of a comprehensive system of international security, which excludes all wars, both nuclear and conventional.

However, today the SDI program remains an integral part of U.S. military doctrine. The defense guidelines for 1984-88, which emerged from he bowels of the Pentagon at the beginning of Reagan's presidency and which are still in force, directly envisage the development of space-based systems, including weapons which can destroy Soviet satellites, and accelerated development of antimissile defense systems for the territory of the United States, with the possible withdrawal of the United States from the ABM Treaty. This document stresses that the military rivalry with the USSR must be channelled into new spheres, thereby rendering all previous Soviet spending on defense pointless and making all Soviet weapons obsolete.

As you can see, here again is the pursuit of a mirage; here again, in the words of former President Nixon, we see hopes of wearing out the Soviet Union.

The present administration is slow to learn.

Is this not the answer to the question: Why do they cling so stubbornly to SDI? Star Wars plans have become the main obstacle to accord on elimination of the nuclear threat. And Washington is now trying in vain to present matters as if we were moving toward agreement.

Only political simpletons could accept the elimination of nuclear weapons as a means to deter U.S. aggression, while receiving a threat from space in return. There are no such simpletons in the Soviet leadership.

It is difficult to reconcile oneself to the fact that because of all this a unique chance has been missed for ridding mankind of the nuclear threat.

Having this in mind, I said at the press conference in Reykjavik that we did not regard the dialogue as finished, and we hoped that, after he returned home, President Reagan would consult with the U.S. Congress and the American people, and would adopt the decision whose need stems logically from what was achieved in Reykjavik.

Something quite different happened. Besides the distortion of the whole picture of the Reykjavik talks -- about which I shall have more to say -- actions have been taken in recent days which, to the normal human view, look simply wild after so important a meeting at the level of the top leadership of the two countries. I am referring to the expulsion from the United States of a further 55 workers from the Soviet Embassy and Consulate. We will of course take retaliatory measures -- very tough measures, so to speak -- on an equal basis. We do not intend to tolerate such a disgrace.

But now I shall speak about something different. What sort of government is it; what can be expected from it in other matters on the international scene; what degree does the unpredictability of its actions reach? It turns out that it not only has no constructive proposals on the key questions of disarmament, but it does not even have the desire to maintain an atmosphere essential for the normal continuation of a dialogue. It turns out that Washington is prepared for neither one nor the other. The conclusion that arises -- and it is a conclusion confirmed by no small experience -- is that every time a ray of light appears in attitudes to the major questions of Soviet-U.S. relations, to the settlement of questions which involve the interests of the whole of mankind, a provocation follows, calculated to wreck the possibility of a positive solution and to poison the atmosphere.

But where is the true face of the U.S. administration? Is it in favor of seeking ways to sort things out and look for solutions, or does it finally want to destroy everything which could serve as the basis for progress, and deliberately rule out every kind of normalization? A very unseemly portrait emerges of the administration of a great country which is quick to take destructive, wrecking actions. Either the President cannot cope with his entourage, which literally breathes hatred toward the Soviet Union and toward everything that can divert international affairs into a calm channel, or he himself wants things to be like this. At any rate, there is no attempt in the White House to control the hawks. And this is very dangerous.

As for informing the American people about Reykjavik, this is what happened, absolutely in keeping with what has been said earlier. They concealed the facts from them. They were told only the half-truth about which I spoke earlier. They distorted matters to appear that the United States, acting from a position of strength, practically wrung from the Soviet Union agreement to reach an accord on U.S. conditions. And the day is not far off when the United States, they say, will get what it wants. There must be no let-up in the tempo of military preparations, the Star Wars program must be pushed through, and pressure be stepped up in all directions, they say.

These last few days showed a great cause drowning in petty politicking. They are sacrificing the vital interests of their own people, their allies, and international security as a whole to the weapons' manufacturers. How much has been said about the openness of American society and about the freedom of information, about pluralism of opinions, and about the fact that everyone may see and hear what he or she wants.

In Reykjavik the President, in pointing out the differences between our systems, said to me: We recognize the freedom of the press and the right to hear any point of view.

I am quoting his words here. But what is the actual state of affairs? Here's a very recent fact. I was told that our public organization APN [NOVOSTI news agency] has published in English the tests of my press conference in Reykjavik and speech on Soviet television. APN has sent them off to numerous countries, including the United States. But the brochure with these texts has been held up for several days now by U.S. customs; it is not being allowed through to U.S. readers. So much for the right to hear out any point of view.

Or, concerning humanitarian affairs, I said to the President: Take cinema, for example. A huge number of U.S. films are shown on Soviet screens. Through these films Soviet people have the opportunity to picture the Americans' way of life and way of thinking. In free America, Soviet films are hardly shown at all. The President avoided answering and, as is usual in such cases, took cover behind private enterprise, which, as he said, does what it likes.

I also spoke to him about the publication of U.S. books in our country, and of our books in the United States; there is a ratio here of approximately 20 to 1. I also brought up with the President the question of radio information. I said that here, too, we are in an unequal situation. You have surrounded the Soviet Union with a network of radio transmitters and you broadcast whatever you like 24 hours a day from the territory of other countries and in many languages of the Soviet Union. Taking advantage of the fact that we are not close neighbors, the United States has used the medium-waves to fence itself off from the information carried by our radios. There they only have medium-wave receivers. The President was unable to put up any argument to this either.

I then proposed to him that we should do the following: We shall stop jamming the Voice of America and you shall give us the opportunity on your territory or somewhere nearby of setting up radio broadcasts to the United States so that it will get through to the population of your country. The President promised he would think about it.

It would seem the United States is becoming an increasingly closed society; they are cunningly and efficiently cutting the people there off from objective information. This is a dangerous process.

The American people should know the truth of what goes on in the Soviet Union, the true content of Soviet foreign policy, our real intentions, and indeed the truth about the situation in the world as a whole. I would say that at the current stage this takes on exceptional significance.

Now, about the way the results of Reykjavik are being presented in the United States: It only took a few hours, or days at most, to start submerging everything that was discussed in Reykjavik in a fog of inventions and fantasies. They are trying to kill off the seeds of trust before they put out shoots. A few days ago the President stated that only ballistic missiles were the subject of agreement, and his aides said plainly that bombers and all cruise missiles remain untouchable. The secretary of state provided a diffierent version, that accord concerned all strategic weapons. By the way, he was present at my conversations with the President, as was Comrade Shevardnadze, our minister of foreign affairs. Mr Speakes, on behalf of the White House, stated that perhaps Reagan had not been properly understood, and that the President had never agreed to the elimination of all nuclear arms.

Matters have gone as far as plain misrepresentations. For example, it is being asserted that at the meeting which took place, the President of the United States had not agreed to the Soviet proposal for total elimination of all offensive strategic weapons of the USSR and the United States by 1996, and that it had not been possible to come to a single point of view about this proposal of ours. With a complete sense of responsibility, as a participant in the talks, I state: The President gave his agreement, although not with any particular enthusiasm, to eliminating all offensive strategic weapons, I stress, all, and not just some individual ones, and scrapping them over a period of 10 years, in two stages.

The interpretations of the discussion of the problem of nuclear tests are also far from the truth. The unilateral approach to this question by the United States is being portrayed such that the Soviet Union is supposed to have expressed full agreement with it. There was nothing of the kind, nor could there be. The issue of scrapping medium-range missiles in Europe is also not being presented correctly. It is bad enough that it is being withdrawn from the package proposed by the Soviet side. But even our agreement to freezing the number of missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km is beginning to be portrayed as an acknowledgement of the part of the Soviet Union of the United States' right to deploy [razmestit'] in Western Europe U.S. missiles of the same class.

If these are the interpretations put on things, one soon starts having doubts. What were we talking about in Reykjavik, then? About removing the nuclear threat, about reducing and getting rid of nuclear weapons; or was it about how this threat can be further increased, about diversifying nuclear arsenals, about making into an arena of military confrontation not only the whole planet but also outer space and the universe? This is the impression one gets, comrades.

The prospect of a possible Soviet-U.S. mutual understanding has frightened certain people so much so that they have set about, well in advance, the construction of totally inconceivable barriers and the invention of preliminary conditions. An assistant of the President went so far as to say that the United States, before embarking on nuclear disarmament, should see a change in the political climate in the Soviet Union. All this is frivolous, extremely frivolous.

When similar claims were put forward 70 or even 40 years ago they could be interpreted as being thoughtless, as historical blindness. Right now this is a demonstration of a total lack of understanding of reality. The matter of conventional armaments is also being named as a preliminary condition. This is a quite serious matter in itself.

To this day the assertion about the superiority of the Soviet Union and the states of the Warsaw Pact in conventional armaments was a widespread thesis. It is that which allegedly forces NATO to constantly build up its nuclear potential. Of course, there is no imbalance at all. After Reykjavik, this fact was admitted for the first time in public by Mr Shultz and Mr Regan. But the essence of the problem does not boil down to the maintenance of parity. We do not wish the arms race to be transferred from the sphere of nuclear arms to the sphere of conventional weapons.

May I remind you that our January proposals on eliminating nuclear weapons before the end of the century also contained provisions for doing away with chemical weapons and profoundly reducing conventional weapons. We have repeatedly returned to this issues since January, too.

In their most developed form, the proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries were drawn up this summer in Budapest. We sent them to the other side, by which I mean the members of NATO. To date there has been no reply.

Each day since Reykjavik demonstrates that the meeting in Iceland was the touchstone against which one can measure the true worth of the words and declarations of politicians. How many times was it recited that we must rid ourselves of the nuclear nightmare, how one could breathe easily in a nuclear-free world it only the USSR and the United States could move this problem out of deadlock? But no sooner had a gleam of hope appeared than many of those who just yesterday were cursing nuclear weapons and proclaiming adherence to the idea of a nuclear-free world made themselves scarce. You can even hear voices in Western Europe saying that it is hard to give up American nuclear wepaons, American missiles. It is evidently the case that those who make policy in the West do not think of nuclear weapons on the defensive level at all. Otherwise it is difficult to explain why they are now seeking out pretexts for keeping the missiles or expressng their support for the SDI program at government level. There is something here to ponder for both us and for the West European public.

There are even more refined maneuvers going on alongside the frontal attacks. You cannot take from the negotiating table what is more advantageous, while ignoring what, for vaious reasons, is not to your liking. They say that we -- the Soviet side -- put forward our fundamental proposals in a package. But a package is a balance of interests and concessions, a balance for removing anxieties, an interdependence of security interests. It is as if everything here is on one side of the scales. Both sides have to be balanced.

This is probably why the West wants this logically based and just option for total accord split up into parts, without doing anything to restore the balance of compromise. All our proposals advanced in Reykjavik are objectively linked to central strategic weapons systems.

Our concessions are also part of the package. If there is not package, there will be no concessions either. This is a reality of our national security. But such an approach would also guarantee the security of the United States and all other countries. That is also why we attach such importance to strengthening the ABM Treaty. For out part, there is no attempt to put an end to it. On the contrary, we are against revising supplementing it, or the like, and especially against replacing it with something else, as the President said in Reykjavik, or maybe he made a mistake. I was, I must admit, very surprised when during the meeting he started trying to convince the Soviet side and me personally: If you don't treat the ABM Treaty as holy scripture, then how do you treat treaties? As a piece of paper, or what? Without strict observance of treaties, and especially such a fundamental one, you will not ensure international order and elementary stability. Then arbitrariness and chaos will reign in the world.

I say again: When they prefer SDI to nuclear disarmament, only one conclusion is possible: By means of this military program they are attempting to refute the axiom of international relations in our epoch contained in the simple and clear words beneath which the U.S. President and I put our signature last year. Here are those words: Nuclear war must not be waged. Victory cannot be gained in it.

In conclusion, I will say: The Soviet Union has put the maximum good will into its proposals. We are not withdrawing these proposals. We are not withdrawing them. All that has been said to make them well-founded and to develop them remains in force.

Goodbye, comrades. All the best.

BOVIN EXPLAINS OBJECTIONS, ALTERNATIVES TO SDI

PM220940 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Political observer A. Bovin article: "The Main Obstacle"]

[Text] R. Reagan's great illusion blocked the way to the great compromise which M.S. Gorbachev offered in Reykjavik. Refusing to accept this compromise or to acknowledge the balance of concessions, the U.S. President continued with fanatical stubbornness to defend his "Strategic Defense Initiative."

Asserting that SDI as an impenetrable space shield remains a utopia, THE NEW YORK TIMES describes the events in Iceland in these terms: "Reagan had a chance to destroy Soviet and U.S. medium-range nuclear armaments in Europe, to make progress toward banning nuclear tests on his own terms, to reduce the nuclear arsenals by one-half in 5 years, and to agree on a colossal reduction at a later date. To this he said 'no'...It is probably possible to put forward arguments to support the idea that illusory birds in the bush are worth sacrificing for a Soviet bird in the hand. To date, however, the President has not proved this."

It is hard to prove the unprovable. It is much more interesting to examine the arguments which R. Reagan and his immediate entourage use to try to explain the positions of the United States and the USSR (in one case justification, in the other, naturally, condemnation).

Let us begin with the arguments which are supposed to show the Americans and world public opinion just why the White House maintains a death-grip on SDI.

First, the problem of nuclear weapons belonging to third countries. "If at some future moment," Vice Admiral J. Poindexter, the U.S. President's national security assistant, claims, "the process of the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons will be wrecked and if nuclear weapons proliferate...it is prudent and logical that not only the United States but also the Soviet Union should really want some sort of defense system..." This argument may be called the "madman's argument" since, as a rule, it is set out citing the example of the madman who may get hold of a ballistic missile somewhere and launch it.

Second, the question of insurance against the nonobservance of treaty commitments. "It is likely," J. Matlock, the U.S. President's special assistant for national security, muses, "that we shall never be able to ensure verification [proverka] to such a degree that absolute certainty can be guaranteed that no one in the world has any missiles left." And since there is no such certainty, there should be a defense system which would guarantee complete security. Matlock expresses himself intelligently. This argument is usually accompanied by references to possible "Soviet deception" and to the effect that the Soviet Union will probably decide to conceal a missile or two so as then to be able to threaten U.S. security.

There is no point in writing for the umpteenth time that our country strictly observes the commitments it has assumed. But there is a point in reminding people that confidence (or the lack thereof) is a mutual problem. Just as the hypothesis of the madman is a mutual problem. And if you follow U.S. logic, the logic of the "insurance policy," the Soviet Union should deploy its own "insurance" system. Incidentally, the Americans do not object to that. But we do. And we object because, in our opinion, defense against every possible eventuality which may occur only once does not require fantastic expenditure or the transformation of near-earth space into an arsenal of different types of space weapons.

As for the situation that will arise if the nonproliferation system is disrupted, it may require solutions about which it is hard to say anything definite at present. In any event, all the presently feasible ways of reducing arms are based on the assumption that the nonproliferation system will continue to operate.

Third, the problem of incentives and trump cards. The White House views the continuation of work on SDI as the best incentive for keeping the "Russians" at the negotiating table, as a good trump card capable of forcing them to agree to arms reductions. "SDI," R. Perle, U.S. assistant secretary for defense on international security policy, stated, "is the locomotive which pulls the train of arms control." To prove that thesis the Americans should abandon SDI and see whether the arms control train stops. If you accept Washington's approach, we should on no account agree to a reduction of ground-based heavy ballistic missiles since it is that threat which is supposed to keep the Americans at the negotiating table....

Incidentally, about trump cards: I will quote P. Warnke, erstwhile head of the U.S. delegation to the Soviet-U.S. arms control talks. "There is no doubt that SDI is a good trump card. The question is when it will be played," Warnke said. "We will never get more for SDI than we could have gotten at Reykjavik. As the absurdity of the system comes to light we will get less and less for it. We must play this trump card now while it is still worth something." Well? Sensible advice, it seems to me.

So, there will be a trillion-dollar "Star Wars" program comprising hundreds, if not thousands, of unique ground installations and space platforms and new technological frontiers -- and all to pressure those holdouts who do not want disarmament and to defend against nuclear madmen and cunning frauds. All this hardly seems serious. Weak, fabricated, labored arguments. You get the impression they are needed to divert attention from the real, main argument. SDI is needed because hope has not yet been lost of forging ahead and acquiring strategic advantages. It was no accident the C. Weinberger noted that if it implements SDI the United States will be in the same position as when it had a monopoly on the atom bomb. That is the argument. Clear and comprehensible.

Now let us see what motives and what explanations are being advanced in the United States to elucidate the USSR's negative attitude to the "Star Wars" program.

We will start with a reexamination. M.S. Gorbachev's position is described in the following way: "derailing" SDI and "destroying our (that is, American) defense shield." But in fact M.S. Gorbachev's proposals did no go that far. Of course it would be good if SDI were abandoned once and for all. But at the present time such a demand would be unrealistic. The proposal was different. Since the President himself has repeatedly stated that SDI is exclusively a research program -- go ahead, carry out research, development [razrabotki], and even testing, but without leaving the laboratory. For at least the next 10 years.

In view of the multilayered full-scale ABM system as conceived by the President, the proposed limitations would hardly have a tangible delaying effect on research work since, as THE WASHINGTON POST claims, there is a conviction in scientific circles that "the United States can study what is needed while staying within the framework of laboratory research for 10 years."

Realistically, the Soviet proposal could hamper plans to create limited ABM systems intended primarily to protect strategic military targets and command centers. But that is precisely what we want, since the creation of such systems would change the correlation of strategic forces in favor of the United States and hamper nuclear disarmament.

But Washington is naturally putting a different slant on our intentions. Listen to P. Buchanan, White House communications director. First he asks the question, and not just a question but the "fundamental" question: "Why does this program -- which exists only in theory, will hardly defend the United States, and poses no threat to anyone in the world -- represent such a frightening problem for the Soviet Union?" The answer was: "For a whole generation the Soviet Union has invested $1 trillion in ballistic missiles which could destroy all its enemies and against which there is no defense. The United states now wants to rely on defensive systems which threaten nobody. These defensive systems could turn that monstrous arsenal into garbage. They would mark the end of its usefulness for scaring, threatening, and blackmailing others. Reagan's SDI does not threaten Soviet citizens. It poses a threat to the possible use of that monstrous arsenal for scaring others and, in my opinion, that is precisely why Mr Gorbachev went to Iceland in order to shoot it down, and that is precisely why he failed."

It is hard to take this traditinal rubbish, which boils down to the "Soviet threat," seriously. But we will try. If Buchanan is right and the Soviet Union cannot get by without its "monstrous arsenal for scaring others," then in response to SDI the Soviet Union should set about increasing that arsenal. But if the Soviet Union itself is proposing to eliminate both its own and U.S. nuclear arms, that means Buchanan is wrong. It is SDI, even though it "exists only in theory," that is preventing nuclear potentials being turned into "garbage." And Reykjavik has shown just that once again.

P. Buchanan is also wrong when he claims that the ABM defense systems which are being designed in the United States "threaten nobody." J. Poindexter puts this argument more subtly. One of the reasons for the "Russians'" concern, he says, "lies in the fact that they probably do not trust us and that they believe that we are working on a system which, when we have created it, will provide us with a first strike facility. However, the point is that if we are prepared to eliminate all offensive ballistic missiles prior to deploying it, the problem of a first strike ceases to exist." In ideal circumstances this is what is supposed to happen. However, "ideal circumstances" belong to the realm of theory rather than practice. In practice on the other hand, if one side is intensively working on the creation [sozdaniye] of ABM systems, then the lower the levels of the offensive potentials are, the fewer delivery vehicles and charges there are, the easier it is -- by means of a sudden breakthrough in one area or another -- to disrupt the equilibrium, to outstrip the other side, to gain a strategic advantage. And we cannot fail to take this potential threat into account.

Nor can we ignore the obvious fact that defense systems can also have offensive potential. Thus, for instance, virtually all types of arms that are being developed [razrabatyvayemyye] under the "Star Wars" program are capable of destroying satellites without which missile attack observation and warning systems cannot function. But this is only half the problem. [paragraph continues]

Let us examine the other half of the problem as presented by R. Perle: The Soviet Union "is worried that in the course of the implementation of SDI we may somehow come across technical solutions which could be used in the sphere of offensive arms, and the Russians are trying to prevent this." It is not often that one can agree with Perle. But this is one such occasion. We are indeed concerned at the fact that it may be possible, via the "Star Wars" program, to arrive at fundamentally new types of weapons and that an arms race in this area would wipe out all plans for nuclear disarmament.

The Americans are insisting all the time: Do not worry, believe in our good intentions, we will cause you no harm, we need SDI only and exclusively as an "insurance," as a shield.... And we would very much like to believe this. But it is not possible. Intentions are a purely subjective and changeable matter. Therefore we must consider not just what Washington wants but also what it is capable of. Objective potential rather than intentions must be the subject of analysis. And the analysis indicates that a one-sided implementation of SDI can provide the United States with the opportunity to break out of the military-strategic parity and, consequently, to sharply destabilize the world situation and intensify the threat of war.

There are two ways of preserving parity.

First: The Soviet Union embarks on the implementation of a parallel program of its own. Parity is preserved, but the arms race continues. A three-fold arms race because the rivalry embraces offensive weapons, defense systems, and countermeasure systems. The balance of fear, distrust, and suspicion is reestablished at an increasingly higher level. It is not the sides' equal security that increases but rather the equal danger to both of them.

Second: The United States abandons the development and deployment [razrabatyvat i rasvorachivat] of the ABM defense system. This would make it possible to markedly lower the level of nuclear confrontation in the foreseeable future and to embark on a transition to a nuclear-free world.

The Soviet Union's choice is clear. We are resolutely against supplementing or replacing the arms race onearth with an arms race in space. Now Washington must choose. "In my view," Senator R. Byrd said a few days ago, "SDI must not be the rock on which the arms control process founders." Quite true. Reykjavik revealed the problem. The main obstacle on the path toward disarmament is the "Star Wars" program and its advocates. And this is not a problem of Soviet-American relations. It is a problem which affects all mankind.

CHERNYSHEV DISCUSSES PROPOSED ARMS CURB 'PACKAGE'

PM221319 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Oct 86 Second Edition p 3

[Military observer V. Chernyshev "TASS Commentary for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "Reykjavik and the Geneva Talks"]

[Text] The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms have resumed in Geneva. Without any doubt, after the summit in Reykjavik the participants in the talks will have more work to do. During the preparations for the summit and in Reykjavik itself the USSR made it possible to remove the obstacles and stereotypes which had accumulated at the talks and formulated a bold new platform which increases the chances of ultimate success.

As the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has declared, the Soviet Union is not withdrawing the proposals it introduced in Reykjavik. All this has created a qualitatively new situation and laid the gorundwork for a possible step forward toward real progress, provided that the United States finally adopts realistic positions and abandons unrealistic dreams when making assessments.

It would seem that in the prevailing new conditions it is no longer possible to act in the old way. However, certain people in Washington have not the least intention of giving up their methods of which most people are sick to death. So for instance, despite the position that was clearly set out by the Soviet Union -- namely, that its proposals are of a comprehensive nature, that they are a package -- ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration have been holding forth daily about some kind of possibility to extract what is advantageous for Washington from this package and to abandon the rest.

Above all, clearly intent on reassuring angry and alarmed West Europe, for whom SDI blocked out the bright ray of light which appeared at the end of the nuclear missile tunnel, the Washington representatives are talking about the prospects of achieving a separate agreement on medium-range missiles. Such claims are totally unfounded.

The talks in Geneva will be conducted in all the areas -- space arms, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range means. In each of these areas a separate agreement may be drawn up. However, the decision to put them into effect must be a comprehensive one, taking into account all the elements of the nuclear problem.

The Soviet Union has every reason to adopt this approach. First, the USSR's territory, as distinct from U.S. territory, is exposed to a double threat -- the threat from the U.S. strategic triad (ICBM's, SLBM's, and heavy bombers) and the threat from U.S. medium-range missiles and forward-based means deployed around the Soviet Union. The U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles deployed in Western Europe are essentially strategic means in respect of the Warsaw Pact countries.

In addition, the Soviet Union is threatened by 560 nuclear-equipped aircraft based on 14 U.S. aircraft carriers and hundreds of U.S. nuclear-equipped aircraft deployed in the immediate vicinity of the USSR's borders. The USSR has removed medium-range missiles from the strategic equation, but has simultaneously proposed a solution of the question of this class of weapons as part of the same package. While agreeing to a substantial reduction of its medium-range missiles in Asia and leaving the U.S. forward-based means aside for the time being, it envisages that the question of dismantling all the nuclear arms of the sides will be resolved at the next stage.

Second, the British and French nuclear potentials which are quite impressive and continue to be built up and improved form part of the Eurostrategic balance. When expressing readiness to competely leave aside the question of British and French nuclear weapons, the USSR acted on the assumption that the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe will take place in parallel with deep cuts in the strategic nuclear potentials of the USSR and the United States. And this linkage is extremely important because the British and French have promised on more than one occasion to join in the process of nuclear arms reduction and elimination at the point when the Soviet Union and the United States embark on the substantial reduction of their nuclear forces.

Third, when drastic cuts in nuclear arms -- strategic offensive arms and medium-range arms -- are made, it is necessary to provide a guarantee that neither side will seek to achieve military superiority during this time, that it will not create new means capable of undermining stability and parity. Such a guarantee would be provided by a tightening of the ABM Treaty which would ensure that over a period of 10 years -- that is, the period of the reduction and elimination of nuclear arms, neither side would have the right to withdraw from the treaty or conduct research and tests under the SDI program beyond the laboratory stage.

Everything that has been said bears out the close objective interdependence of all the components of the Soviet package of proposals. This indicates that the Soviet Union has a clear idea of the ultimate goal and practical philosophy of disarmament. Regrettably, the United States still lacks either of these, which explains the statements about the possibility of extracting certain things from the Soviet package and using them to unilateral advantage.

VELIKHOV ARGUES CASE FOR NUCLEAR TEST BAN

LD221327 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 40, 13 Oct 86 pp 6-8

[USSR Academy of Sciences Vice President Yevgeniy Velikhov article: "A Matter of Politics, Not Science"]

[Text] When the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water was signed in Moscow in 1963, it omitted underground tests. This was not because the sides wanted to continue them, but because they could not agree on verification measures. Nevertheless, on the insistance of the Soviet side, the preamble to the Moscow treaty recorded the desire of the parties concerned to achieve a final halt on all nuclear tests and to continue negotiations towards that end. Twenty-three years have passed since then, and it has to be said that in this time all U.S. presidents, with the exception of the present one, have officially supported a comprehensive ban on all tests. But in doing so they have cited the problems of verificatin as the chief obstacle.

Today there exists a real historical opportunity to end all nuclear weapon tests immediately and definitively. Ending them would facilitate the achievement of a concrete objective -- the prevention of the development of new destabilizing types of nuclear weapon -- as the experience of preceding decades shows that the development and improvement of new nuclear weapons are the main sources of instability. What happened after the signing of the above treaty offers an example in point. Continuing underground tests made it possible to develop more compact and accurate weapons and multiple warheads, and there is a consensus among scientists, experts and the military that this has undermined stability and increased the danger of still greater destabilization.

Judging from the tests the U.S. is currently carrying out on its proving ranges, the development of new weapon systems is proceeding in two directions.

First, there are the so-called third-generation nuclear weapons.

Second, there is the neutron bomb-type weapon geared to the concept of localized nuclear wars.

An end to nuclear tests would not only bring stability but would ensure a smooth and secure transition from a nuclear to a non-nuclear world along the lines indicated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement of January 15, 1986. This is a vivid example of new thinking in the nuclear age. The Soviet leadership has come to the conclusion that the security of the U.S.S.R. can be ensured not by the further buildup of new types of nuclear weapon but, on the contrary, by the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the subsequent complete destruction of these weapons. This new thinking has found expression in the Soviet moratorium and its extension until January 1, 1987. The move is eloquent proof of the seriousness of the Soviet intention to make our world a safe home for man.

Among the many arguments the U.S. Administration has advanced in opposing a comprehensive test ban is that existing methods fail adequately to verify compliance with any such agreement.

This argument has now been unanimously rejected by the entire world geophysical community. The questions were discussed by a forum of scientists from 36 countries in Moscow last summer. It has been proved that all nuclear explosions essential to weapon development, including those with a yield of several kilotons, can be reliably monitored by national means. Experiments show that a seismic system deployed in Norway can detect nuclear explosions with a yield of hundreds of tons deep inside the Soviet Union. In an experiment held in the U.S., a 5-ton explosion was detected at a distance of 725 kilometres from the Kirkland test site where it took place.

The overall conclusion of the Moscow forum of scientists was that geophysical methods today make it fully possible to verify compliance with a comprehensive nuclear test ban. A concrete example is the above-mentioned powerful seismic station in Norway (NORSAR) which took measurements in conditions of high seismic activity by analyzing the signal over a wide band of frequencies, including very high frequency. As a result, the signal from a very small explosion could be identified against a seismic background. According to many scientists, the best monitoring equipment in the world is NORES, part of the NORSAR system, also deployed in Norway. The United States, too, possesses powerful seismographic instruments. The Soviet Union and other countries also have their systems. Among these countries are the Delhi Six which have said they are ready to cooperate in international monitoring of compliance with a comprehensive test ban. In short, there is a reliable network of seismic stations capable of the most effective verification.

As early as the 1960's when the draft treaty banning nuclear tests was discussed, the United States put forward the thesis that nuclear tests could in principle be concealed by creating a large underground cavern for tests. However, today, with the use of high-frequency monitoring methods, such an attempt would fail. The transition to higher frequencies in the 30-40-hertz range makes it possible to register explosions held in such caverns. Futhermore, the past 20 years have seen marked advances in the space surveillance system. The creation of such a huge cavern, involving work comparable to the building of an Egyptian pyramid, could certainly be detected from outer space. The combination of seismic methods with observation from space would be ample to ensure compliance with a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

To ensure further advance in this direction and resolve a series of other issues connected with verification and involving geographical information, Soviet scientists have discussed a proposal made by American scientists from the Natural Resources Defence Council to conduct joint geophysical research on the territory close to the Semipalatinsk testing site and in Nevada, U.S.A. [paragraph continues]

They have asked the Soviet and U.S. Governments for permission to hold such experiments. The Soviet Government has acceded to this request.

Early positive results have already been obtained with the help of seismographs installed near Semipalatinsk. This would seem to have put paid to all arguments that a test ban is unverifiable. However, the American side has promptly come up with new ones. It has suggested, for example, that very small charges could be tested in deep space outside the solar system. Specious arguments.

In general, American objections to stopping nuclear tests are extremely contradictory. They merely highlight the weakness of the Reagan administration's position in seeking to justify its policy in the eyes of world public opinon, which strongly favours an end to all nuclear tests.

Washington is trying to replace the question of verification of a nuclear test ban with the problem of verification of the Soviet-Americn treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests (which are not to exceed the 150-kiloton threshold). But accurate measurement of the size of an explosion is one thing and verifying that no nuclear tests are being carried out is another. The latter is undoubtedly much easier than checking compliance with the threshold.

American officals declare that they need tests to ensure the security of the United States, by which they mean the implementation of the SDI programme (involving tests in the neighbourhood of 150 kilotons to develop a new-generation weapon).

To judge from speeches by the President and the administration spokesmen, they are trying to combine incompatibles. On the one hand, they argue that the Strategic Defense Initiative is aimed at creating defensive means that would render nuclear weapons unnecessary and obsolete. On the other, they are testing just such nuclear systems, notably the X-ray laser, for the components of a space-based anti-missile defence. The argument advanced to justify this approach is absurd: the United States wants to see what the Soviet Union can achieve by creating and testing such weapons.

Meanwhile there is a very simple way to solve the problem, and that is to accede immediately to the moratorium. After that all nuclear tests in the Soviet Union and the United States would stop and third-generation weapons would never see the light of day.

Another argument is that nuclear tests are necessary because this is the only way the U.S. can guarantee the reliability and life cycle of its present nuclear weapons. Incidentally, when this question was put to Dr Glenn Seaborg, former chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, who took part in the drafting of the Moscow treaty, he said that in the 1960s and early 1970s, when he had access to all classified information, U.S. nuclear weapons were designed in such a way as to make it possible to check their reliability and usability not by nuclear tests but by other control methods which scientists already had at their disposal at the time.

But if the U.S. could control the reliability of its nuclear weapons without resorting to tests twenty years ago, what is preventing it from doing so today? Incidentally, the bulk of nuclear arsenals is not to be tested as they exceed the 150-kiloton threshold. Statistics show that while it takes dozens of tests to develop a weapon, only a few are needed to check existing ones.

Moreover, it is clear that the Soviet Union is as interested as the U.S. in keeping its weapons in reliable shape. And if one side is ready for a test ban this is proof that tests are not necessary, at least where checking the combat readiness of weapons is concerned.

Thus, all the objective facts inexorably lead to the sole logical and valid conclusion, namely, that the Americans only need nuclear tests to develop modern nuclear weapons, and offensive, first-strike weapons at that. No arguments, or rather excuses, on the part of Washington can refute or obscure this. The world public, authoritative scientists and competent specialists welcome the bold and responsible decision of the Soviet Union to extend its moratorium and urge the United States to join it. Let me remind you that an overwhelming majority of the states that signed the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in 1968 are now calling for an end to all tests in accordance with the commitments implicit in the text of the treaty, as well as in the 1963 Moscow treaty and the 1974 treaty on threshold tests.

All this shows is that a total end to all nuclear tests is a political issue. As Mikhail Gorbachev said in his interview to the newspaper RUDE PRAVO, "the attitude to the termination of nuclear tests, to the early elaboration of a treaty on their full prohibition has now become the most reliable touchstone of how seriously each of the greatest nuclear powers treats disarmament, international security and the cause of peace."

There are sufficient ways and means to verify compliance with a treaty with the U.S. banning nuclear tests. It is not a matter of technology. It is constantly being improved, and verification methods, too, may continue to improve after the agreement is signed. It is entirely a question of political will, and the international community expects Washington to offer concrete evidence to such will at this extremely difficult juncture in history.

UN ENVOY EXTOLS VERIFICATION FOR ARMS CONTROL

LD222311 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] New York October 22 TASS -- The comprehensive, strictest verification is the major element of the disarmament process, the USSR's permanent representative to the United Nations, Aleksandr Belonogov, has pointed out.

Speaking in the first committee of the U.N. General Assembly today, he set out the Soviet Union's approach to this aspect of the complex of problems of arms limitation and disarmament.

"The significance of this question is explained by the acute need for achieving a turn for the better in the international arena, overcoming the negative, confrontational trends that were growing in recent years, and paving the way for curtailing the arms race on earth and keeping it from outer space."

This had been confirmed by the Reykjavik meeting, Belonogov said. In expressing its readiness for deep cuts in nuclear armaments, the Soviet side favoured not only strict verification in any forms, but also the toughening of demands on it.

Verification in conditions of the post-nuclear situation should be comprehensive. It should give full confidence in reliable compliance with agreements at all stages of arms reduction.

The deficit of the new political thinking in the U.S. position, however, thwarted the meeting, as a result of which the historic chance to agree on the entire package of verifiable agreements, was missed.

While materializing the new political thinking, the Soviet Union attached special importance to the verification problem, said the Soviet ambassador to the U.N.

"We said more than once: The USSR is open to verificaion, we are interested in it as much as others. The attempts to use references to verification issues in order to evade arms control and disarmament agreements are immoral and unconscientious, they are destructive in their very essence.

On a broad scale, the verification problem has been removed from the agenda as an obstacle to accords. What is required is constructive solution of this problem. Precisely here one see sometimes the absence of real readiness to strengthen verification measures and confidence."

The productivity of the new approaches, the need for their implementaton were convincingly revealed in the results of the Stockholm conference.

At present, when the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions was in its second year, all, even those who asserted the contrary, could not fail to see that it was not the verification issue, nor the Soviet stance on this matter, that constituted the major obstacle to concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

The problem of verifying compliance with a ban on spreading the arms race into outer space could be effectively resolved too. But the "Star Wars" programme, once it was carried out, would create insurmountable difficulties from the viewpoint of verification. The implementation of the SDI programme would cross out the verification concept, Belonogov said.

"We stand for effective and adequate verification, so that issues of disarmament and verification be examined and resolved in a business-like way, so that a dynamic approach be made to mutually acceptable solutions," the Soviet representative emphasised.

Belonogov called on other nations to give a constructive response to this approach to the solutin of verification issues, of the entire complex of problems of arms limitation and disarmament.

BURLATSKIY: USSR'S REYKJAVIK EFFORTS 'NOT IN VAIN'

PM151051 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Oct 86 p 2

[Report by special correspondent Fedor Burlatskiy: "Yet We Remain Optimistic"]

[Text] Reykjavik -- Everyone or practically everyone who was in Reykjavik during the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan had the same or nearly the same feeling: first elation, a feeling that important decisions were not far off, and then a sharp decline in the mood, disappointment.

When we met with U.S. experts and journalists after the talks on the morning of 12 October, they were all but unanimous in saying or hinting that accords had been reached on such major matters as a 50 percent reduction in the whole triad of strategic armaments, the total elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, and agreement to talks on banning (first limiting) underground nuclear tests and reducing the nuclear potential in Asia.

But the afternoon talks flattened hopes of these agreements, which would have far greater significance for the disarmament process than SALT I and SALT II put together.

What was the reason for the breakdown? Why did the U.S. President go back on his word at the last moment? What ghost in that "haunted house," where the talks were being held, whispered the fateful "no" to him? Perhaps the part of the ghost was played by Mr Richard Perle -- I met him at the U.S. press center: Yet another handsome Hollywood movie hero; you would never suspect that his favorite part was that of a military-industrial complex hawk. Or perhaps the President had been seeking an excuse to wreck the talks from the outset?

No doubt our readers have already seen on television or read in the newspapers M.S. Gorbachev's Reykjavik press conference and know of our extraordinarily important new proposals and our readiness for compromise and mutual concessions in the interests of disarmament and of the drawing together of the two sides' positions, which promised so much. What boldness it needed and what sense of responsibility to our people and to the whold world in order to venture such proposals and risk such concessions! Finally, we learned of the last act in the drama: President Reagan's refusal to make concessions.

What were we thinking about as we left the auditorium after the press conference? We were thinking of course about the reasons for the breakdown. The President's beloved SDI, a "dream," as he himself calls it, the accursed invention of Edward Teller or some other evil genius -- was it the chief obstacle to the historic accords? Or was it something else, something more important and significant for the White House and the entire U.S. establishment?

Yes, of course, it was the "Star Wars" program first and foremost. There can be no doubt on that score. It is already an item in the national budget, orders for it have already been placed with the monopolies, and the President himself has repeatedly promised to fight for SDI to the last drop of blood -- fight against us and, if need be, against his own Congress, his allies, and world public opinion.

And yet... and yet, it is not just SDI. SDI is an element -- probably not the most important -- in Washington's overall strategy. It is a strategy to draw the Soviet Union into a new round of the arms race in space, on land, under ground, and under water. A fantastic race -- both with regard to unimaginable types of weapons and from the viewpoint of expenditure on it.

I have the impression that the United States is even prepared to have some agreement that would lead to the elimination or reduction of chiefly obsolete models of weapons. But it does not want, at least at the moment, definitely does not want to stop the military competition with our country.

Why? Well, military monopolies' dividends are what springs to mind. But there are wider and more multifaceted plans and aims. [paragraph continues]

The first is to sprint ahead in terms of new types of armaments, on the basis of modern technological achievements and with the support of the NATO countries and Japan. Second, to hinder the implementation of our major economic plans, the solution of which would bring our country to the level of the modern technological revolution in all the chief areas of industrial development. The extremeists in the U.S. President's entourage are doing their utmost to disrupt our economic reforms, pressure us, and limit our international influence as much as possible.

Need one say how unrealistic these expectations are? How immoral these aims are? How dangerous it is to play with nuclear and space fire? This is all axiomatic not only as far as we are concerned, but as far as world public opinion is concerned.

Not taking advantage of the opportunity to conclude an agreement! At a time when mankind, weary with nuclear terror, is yearning for decisions inspiring the hope that our children will be living in a different world and will be spared the demeaning sense of helplessness in the face of the inexorable approach of the biblical apocalypse. What irresponsibility! Yes, Mr Reagan surprised me, despite all I knew of him before. History had offered him the opportunity to sign a pardon for mankind. He squandered the opportunity.

And yet . . . and yet, I would not want to draw the curtain after these words and leave the reader in a somber frame of mind. Reykjavik not only taught a lesson, not only demonstrated anew how difficult it is to talk with the American side, how difficult it is to fight for substantial movement away from the nuclear abyss. This round of talks between the leaders of the two nuclear giants also demonstrated that the basis for an agreement still exists and the platform where all countries' interests meet or are close is widening, the positions on many important matters are becoming closer, and the idea of a great compromise for the sake of world peace is gathering strength. Please don't think that these words are merely formal optimism. No, they are the considered result of "the intellect's cold observations, and the heart's sorrowful remarks."

Just a couple of sketches on Reykjavik itself -- if only to express a sense of gratitutde to our exceedingly hospitable hosts. But I must say that the "local color" theme has been almost totally exhausted by many colleagues on the daily newspapers. I will just say that I very much liked the monument to the founder of Reykjavik, Ingolfur Arnarson, the face of a courageous fighter and selfless worker. But there was another monument I did not like one bit -- the one to the envoy of the king of Denmark who seized Iceland: He is depicted wearing a state official's frock coat and high boots, stony-faced and holding the same kind of scroll Rosencrantz and Guidlenstern carried when they took Hamlet to England for execution. I very much liked the president's little house, considerably smaller than the cottages of members of the middle strata. But it seemed strange that one could approach it without having to show a pass and that there was no guard. I liked the fact that the head of state was the charming Vigdis Finnbogadottier, the world's first woman president. And although it grieved me that she did not greet M.S. Gorbachev at the airport, I appreciated the reason: It was the opening of the Althing -- the world's oldest parliament -- and her presence was obligatory.

I liked the fact that the winter in Reykjavik is relatively mild, despite its being the world's most northerly capital. But I did not like the frequent rain in the city whose name means "smoky inlet." I liked the thermal baths, although it seemed overly exotic to pass from a one pool at a temperature of zero to another at a temperature of plus 40 degrees.

I was in raptures over Holmfridur Karlsdottir -- Miss World 1986 (the world's top beauty), an Icelander. But I was extremely upset by the fact that not I, but my friend, Gennadiy Gerasimov, was standing beside her in the photograph hanging in the press center.

Finally, I very much wanted to encounter the specter of a young woman who allegedly still walks in that cozy little house where the talks were held between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. But unfortunately I did not have the opportunity to visit the house.

So let us return to the conclusion. The meeting in Reykjavik between the two leaders of the great powers was a sensation. No one expected it and no one foresaw it, none of the 3,000 correspondents and experts who gathered there from all over the world. Unfortunately it came to naught, although I would like to express this feeling that I have. I believe that in the future the naught could become something substantial. The great efforts by our country and its leadership were not in vain. The main work lies ahead. A new struggle. New initiatives. The involvement of new forces -- in Europe and Asia, in Latin America and Africa -- and new Soviet-American talks and meetings.

L. PONOMAREV FAULTS U.S. 'DISTORTION' OF ABM TREATY

LD221129 Moscow TASS in English 1120 GMT 22 Oct 86

["Why Is the USA Breaking the ABM Treaty?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- Follows commentary by Leonid Ponomarev, a TASS news analyst:

Answering the question why the "problem of interpretation" of the Soviet-American Treaty of Unlimited Duration of the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) systems has become the main barrier in the way of an agreement on arms control between the United States and the Soviet Union, the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES said that the Reagan administration had offered a "very free" interpretation" of the treaty. It will allow the United States to develop and test new space-based defence systems. This is precisely the aim of the White House to use all methods, down to distorting the very presence of the ABM Treaty, and given a "green light" to its plans for a militarization of outer space.

This distortion lies in the unfounded claim that the treaty in its present form does not prevent the implementation of the U.S. SDI programme. It is apt to recall that the ABM Treaty concluded in 1972 proceeds from the basic agreement of the sides that they undertake not to develop, test, or deploy sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile land-based ABM systems or components.

From whatever end you may read that paragraph, it is absolutely impossible being in one's right mind that guided by good intentions to draw the conclusion that the said provision allows the United States to develop and test an anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements. On the contrary, the ABM Treaty is an obstacle to the implementation of the "Star Wars" programmes, therefore the Washington leaders show such a hostile attitude to it.

There is more aspect to that matter. The treaty was concluded in 1972, and only in 1985-1986 the "problem" of its interpretation emerged.

The point is that it is precisely by that time that it became necessary within the framework of the SDI Effort to hold tests including the launching of craft and targets into space. And exactly at that time the Washington leaders started "freely" interpreting the ABM Treaty to justify the SDI. To be more precise, there were no divergencies in the interpretation by the USSR and the USA of the ABM Treaty up to March 1983, when President Reagan proclaimed his "Strategic Defence Initiative". Since that time the U.S. side has steadily led things to a destruction of the ABM Treaty, for undermining its fundamentals.

A proof of that is Washington's stubborn reluctance to strengthen the ABM regime through the adoption by both sides of the commitment not to use the right of abandoning it for ten years. Over that period, in keeping with mutual agreement, apart from eliminating nuclear weapons, the USSR and the USA would strictly observe all provisions of the treaty, the testing of space elements of anti-ballistic missile defence system in outer space, with the exception of those done at laboratories, should be banned. And after the expiry of ten years when there would be no nuclear weapons, the USSR and the USA could outline at special talks mutually acceptable decisions what is to be done next. That is the Soviet side's true stand on that issue. Yet in its wish to ensure military superiority, Washington is trying to preserve and legalize the SDI.

NATO COMMANDER VOICES FEARS ON INF REMOVAL

PM221421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Krivopalov report: "NATO: General Rogers' 'Hobbyhorse'"]

[Text] London -- B. Rogers, supreme commander of the NATO Allied Armed Forces in Europe, has mounted his favorite hobbyhorse again.

The general claims that the NATO military leadership he heads was not informed about the possible steps toward reducing nuclear weapons connected with the Soviet proposals in Reykjavik. He sounded the militarist alarm, saying that NATO would be left unarmed if both sides decided to really remove medium-range missiles from Europe.

Initially Rogers circulated this fabrication in the press and is now repeating it at an official level, so to speak. The four star U.S. general with a deep-rooted interest in "Star Wars" decided to raise this quesion with the NATO countries' defense ministers.

They were gathering at Gleneagles, Scotland, where the North Atlantic bloc's Nuclear Planning Group is meeting.

What will be the response to this diplomatic sally from the ministers, who on this occasion are guests of the UK Government? Well aware of the feelings of the population at large in their own countries, they all understand in principle the attractiveness of the idea of nuclear disarmament in Europe, which the USSR is proposing be carried out even before the end of this century. There is something else they know: The meeting in Reykjavik, which, unfortunately, did not end with a formal accord, showed nevertheless that agreements are possible. All it needs is the political will.

The U.S. military-industrial complex, whose needs are met primarily by General B. Rogers, intends to suppress that political will in the NATO countries even further. Rogers has simply been sent into the attack with the aim of preventing any deviation from the course of the further spiraling of the arms race (SDI above all).

The senior U.S. representative at NATO's Scottish rendezvous is Pentagon boss C. Weinberger, of course. Although tact is not the strongest character trait of this hawk in civilian plumage, on this occasion it seemed somewhat awkward for him to openly criticize what they were working toward in Reykjavik. Thus the role of "troublemaker" was assigned to the career soldier.

NUCLEAR-SPACE TALKS GROUPS MEET IN GENEVA

Space Weapons Group

LD211225 Moscow TASS in English 1213 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva October 21 TASS -- The group on space armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms Group

LD221234 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva October 22 TASS -- A meeting of the strategic arms group was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons.

AUCCTU'S SHALAYEV ADDRESSES WORLD TU CONGRESS

Moscow TRUD in Russian 18 Sep 86 pp 1, 3

[Dispatch by special correspondents R. Kolchanov, V. Nikitin, A. Repin, and N. Shevtsov: "11th World Trade Union Congress: Peace and Labor Are Indivisible"]

[Excerpts] Berlin, 17 Sep -- Berlin's Palace of the Republic is a scene of seething debate from morning until late evening. The 11th World Trade Union Congress, the biggest forum of the planet's working people, is continuing here.

New York journalist Bill Dennison, who found himself in the auditorium among a multitude of people who have traveled from all ends of the world, exclaimed "A veritable United Nations!" Indeed in terms of its broad representation the 11th World Trade Union Congress is on a par with the UN General Assembly. For emissaries from the working people of 154 countries are participating in the forum.

Concern for the destiny of peace, the tasks of ensuring the vital interests of millions of working people, the cohesion of workers' ranks, the role of trade unions under modern conditions these topics are resounding in organic unison from the rostrum of the world trade union forum. [passage omitted]

The speech by AUCCTU Chairman A. Shalayev was listened to with great attention. Under the conditions of the unprecedented exacerbation of the modern world's contradictions, the speaker declared, the 11th World Congress -- the most representative forum in the history of the international trade union movement - is called upon to make a bold and innovative response to the problems which the times are setting before working people and trade unions with unprecedented acuteness.

Just 4 years separate us from the Havana congress, but how significant a shift has occurred during this time in the international trade union movement toward questions of war and peace, and how attention has been focused on the socioeconomic aspect of the arms race. Antiwar actions are increasing among various detachments of the workers' movement, and the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at creating an all-embracing system of international security and ridding the earth of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 are receiving increasingly broad support. They are profoundly consonant with the trade unions' motto today: "The world of labor for world without wars."

The Soviet Union recently adopted a decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions through 1 January 1987. However, this approach to problems of international security is opposed by the militarist policy of the West's ruling circles, and the United States above all, which are trying to belittle the significance of the Soviet peace initiatives.

Seeking to ensure their military superiority over the USSR and the socialist countries, the speaker went on to point out, the West's militarist circles are resorting to the production of increasingly refined and lethal kinds of mass destruction weapons. Here they gamble especially on fanning war hysteria and on chauvinism. They are stepping up expansion with regard to Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and Libya, continuing to pander to the South African racists and the fascist dictatorial regimes in Chile and Paraguay, and continuing intrigues against Arab states and many Asian, African, and Latin American countries which are defending their freedom and independence. [paragraph continues]

We voice constant solidarity with the struggle of those countries' peoples and trade unions.

This year the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament (the Dublin Committee) published a study on the socioeconomic aspects of the arms race. It is a direct indictment of the instigators of the arms race.

I can point out with satisfaction, the AUCCTU chairman continued, that there has recently been a substantial rapproachement of trade unions' positions on the basic problems of peace and security.

But this is not enough now. Practical steps and united action are needed. There is no more pressing or more noble and humane task than that of pooling the efforts of working people and trade unions. Soviet trade unions see this as one of the most important tasks of the 11th World Congress.

The worldwide campaign "Working People and Trade Unions for Peace and Work" proclaimed by the WFTU in International Peace Year has encountered broad support in the USSR, as in a number of other countries. It can already be confidently stated that this campaign his made a definite contribution to the development of the antiwar internationalist tradition in the trade union movement and helped to overcome the isolated nature of trade union actions against the threat of war. We believe that it is expedient to continue and galvanize this worldwide campaign and not confine it to International Peace Year.

We support the immutable desire of the WFTU and of international trade union associations to carry on a dialogue with other international trade union organizations on a most important isue of modern times, the defense of man' chief right -- the right to life.

At the same time, the speaker emphasized, we believe that the WFTU and international trade union associations could make more active use of their potential for widening the antiwar movement of working people and trade unions and stepping up cooperation with various detachments of the international trade union movement and with other progressive forces.

Another problem is the increasingly complex socioeconomic position of working people in developing countries. The international trade union movement today faces the historic duty to pool its efforts against the most refined methods of plundering and exploiting countries, peoples, and hundreds of millions of working people. It is a question, above all, of the monstrous debt slavery imposed on developing countries by the IMF, other international financial organizations, and private multinational banks and companies.

The congress must resolutely advocate the establishment of a new international economic order and demand of financial magnates a deferment, a moratorium, an immediate suspension of payments or the indefinite postponement of repayment of those debts and the interest on them.

We believe that the proposal to convene on a broad basis a world meeting-- "Trade Unions for International Economic Security" -- merits the attention and support of the congress.

A distinctive feature at the present time in the struggle of the trade union movement in capitalist countries for the working people's rights and interests is the fact that this movement is now under dual pressure -- both from employers and from the bourgeois state. [paragraph continues]

Just recently we have witnessed an attempt to smash the U.S. steelworkers' labor union, persecution of the British printworkers' trade union, the smothering of the British miners' strike by Margaret Thatcher's government, and the ousting of French General Labor Confederation activists from enterprises.

This antiworker policy demands, as never before, a strong and resolute class response from trade unions, including the WFTU. In this connection we support the proposal to set up in the very near future an international center for the defense of working people's rights and trade union freedoms.

When speaking of the need for a dialogue in the trade union movement, we must not bypass the problems posed by the rapid progress of science and technology. Our delegation considers it very important to set up an intersectorial trade union committee on new technology and its social consequences. Such a committee would further the exchange of experience and promote cooperation among trade unions in the elaboration of a common strategy in this sphere of great importance to working people.

Of course, the development of dialogue among trade union organizations of different countries and different political orientation is not a simple matter, the speaker emphasized. But these difficulties must be patiently overcome in the name of the fundamental interests of the working class and all working people. What is needed more than ever before from the WFTU is creative questing, flexible thinking, and an innovative approach to interpreting and solving today's problems.

The AUCCTU chairman also spoke about the life of our country, the Soviet people, and trade unions today.

Time inevitably demonstrates, S.A. Shalayev declared in conclusions, that differences in ideological views and in the position and functions of trade unions in our multifaceted but integral world are not an insurmountable obstacle to unity of action. This idea is clearly expressed in the congress slogan: "For unity of action and solidarity among all working people, for work, peace, and social progress." [passage omitted]

GORBACHEV REYKJAVIK NEWS CONFERENCE UN DOCUMENT

LD221514 Moscow TASS in English 1345 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] New York October 22 TASS -- The transcript of Mikhail Gorbachev's news conference in Reykjavik on October 12 has been issued in the United Nations as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council.

GERASIMOV ANNOUNCES STEPS TO 'BALANCE' EXPULSIONS

LD222323 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1949 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Statement by Gennadiy I. Gerasimov, chief of information administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, on 22 October in the Foreign Ministry press center]

[Text] [Announcer] Good evening, comrades. Speaking on television today Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev drew attention to the fact that every time a ray of light appears in people's attitudes toward major questions concerning Soviet-U.S. relations, toward the settlement of questions that involve the interests of the whole of mankind, a provocation, calculated to wreck the possibility of a positive solution and poison the atmosphere, immediately follows. So it is now. The U.S. Administration has taken actions in recent days which, to the normal human view, look quite simply wild after so important a meeting at the level of the top leadership of the two countries. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that we do not intend to let such an outrage pass, that we would take very tough retaliatory measures. The following statement was made at a briefing held at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry today:

[Begin video recording] [Gerasimov] On 21 October the U.S. Administration made its latest anti-Soviet action. Without grounds it declared persona non grata five employees of Soviet diplomatic missions in Washington and San Francisco. Apart from this, the U.S. authorities announced the reduction of numbers in the USSR Embassy and Consulate General in the United States by 50 people. Washington is trying to justify this step, which has a clearly opportunistic and provocative nature, by references to a supposedly existing disproportion in the quantity of persons working in the Soviet and the U.S. missions in the United States and in the USSR respectively.

It should be noted that the U.S. authorities did not start following this discriminatory course against the staff of Soviet institutions in the United States yesterday. A few years ago they established a quota on the number of Soviet personnel working in the United States of America. In mid-September this year the U.S. Government demanded the departure from the United States before the due date of 25 members of the Soviet missions to the United Nations. This act runs totally counter -- and this is confirmed by the appropriate UN officials -- to the agreement concluded between the United States and the United Nations on that organization's headquarters' being situated in New York. This act was calculated to wreck the meeting of ministers of the two countries, then in preparation.

We gave an official warning to the U.S. side that this step would inevitably lead to corresponding countermeasures on the part of the USSR. These measures had really been prepared. However, they were not implemented, merely because the meeting of the two countries' leaders was forthcoming in Reykjavik.

In the circumstances which have now taken shape we cannot remain unconcerned about the unlawful actions of the U.S. Administration. They demand the most resolute response, and we are giving it.

Above all it is necessary to clarify the fictitious issue of the "disproportion" in the number of those in the Soviet and U.S. institutions in Washington, San Francisco, Moscow, and Leningrad. The U.S. Administration is deceiving its own and the international public by claiming that fewer people work in U.S. missions than in ours.

How do things stand in reality?

As a rule, only Soviet citizens work in Soviet embassies abroad. In U.S. embassies, the support staff includes citizens of the host country. Working for the U.S. Embassy on Moscow, therefore, there were in fact more staff than at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. About 460 people are now working at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and in the Consulate General in Leningrad, while in the USSR Embassy in Washington and the Consulate General in San Francisco, there are about 300.

In addition, and this important fact is being carefully concealed by the Americans, up to 500 staff have been coming annually to U.S. diplomatic missions in the USSR on a so-called temporary basis for a period of up to 1 year.

At any one time, therefore, the various functions were being carried out in U.S. diplomatic missions by a far greater number of people than in Soviet establishments in the United States. We have now decided to eliminate this inequality of numbers.

The Soviet Government has adopted the following countermeasures in response to the provocative actions of the United States.

First: In connection with the continuing use of official U.S. missions in the USSR by the U.S. special services for illegal activity against the Soviet Union, the following employees of the U.S. Embassy and consulate general are declared persona non grata:

Thomas Holme, naval attache at the embassy;

Richard Naab, Army attache at the embassy;

Michael Morga, second secretary at the embassy;

Micheal Matera, third secretary at the embassy;

Daniel Grossman, vice consul at the consulate general.

They must leave the Soviet Union by 1 November this year.

Second: The number of U.S. citizens temporarily posted to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow and the Consulate General in Leningrad (for a period of up to 1 year) is being brought firmly into line with the number of Soviet citizens in this category sent to the United States. To a significant extent this shuts off a channel by which several hundred people are brought in to work at the U.S. diplomatic missions every year.

Third: The personnel of the U.S. Embassy and Consulate General in the USSR must at no time exceed the level of personnel at the USSR Embassy in Washington and at the USSR Consulate General in San Francisco.

Fourth: The entry of American citizens into the USSR as guests of the U.S. ambassador and of staff of the U.S. Embassy and Consulate General is being sharply restricted. Every year approximately 200 Americans have come to the USSR under these arrangements. In one way or another they have been used in the work of U.S. institutions in the USSR.

Fifth: The U.S. Embassy in Moscow and the U.S. Consulate General in Leningrad are deprived of all locally recruited staff, on the order of 260 people. At the same time they are forbidden to recruit staff from among the citizens of third countries.

Thus, as a result of the measures we have taken, a complete balance is established in the quantitative sense as far as the personnel of the missions of the two countries is concerned.

The Soviet side will require the United States to strictly observe the principle of reciprocity and equality in all these questions.

Should Washington decide to continue the discriminatory practice regarding the Soviet establishments and citizens in the United States, additional equivalent measures will be taken on our side.

This provocative step by Washington, to which we are now forced to respond, was taken at a moment when, following the meeting in Reykjavik, encouraging tendencies in the development of the international situation had started to strengthen, and the prospect had opened up of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and solving the cardinal questions of nuclear and space weapons.

In these circumstances those forces in the United States which are opposed to all this resorted, as has happened before, to the well-tried method of trying to undermine the possibility of progress by means of provocations and political sabotage. This cannot but elicit concern in the international public. [end video recording]

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1920 GMT on 22 October carries a virtually identical version of Gerasimov's statement, adding in conclusion: "Answers to questions from journalists were given."]

U.S. EXPULSIONS 'DELIBERATE STEP' TO WORSEN TIES

LD230905 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 23 Oct 86

[Text] Washington October 23 TASS -- The illegal decision of the Reagan administration of the reduction of the personnel of the Soviet Embassy in Washington and the General Consulate of the USSR in San Francisco is a deliberate step to worsen Soviet-American relations and undermine prospects for the conclusion of accords in different fields between the two countries. This opinion is expressed in the USA and other Western countries by political and public figures as well as mass media.

John Warner, prominent Republican senator, described the administration's actions as immature and illtimed from the point of view of international relations. THE WASHINGTON POST says that the State Department had doubts about such a drastic action, but representatives of the Department of Justice, the FBI and CIA insisted it. Their opinion prevailed, the newspaper says, during the White House discussion of the matter of Monday, in which Secretary of State Shultz, Secretary of Justice [title as received] Meese, Vice President Bush, CIA Director Casey and the head of the White House staff Regan took part.

As in the past, Washington's groundless and discriminatory decision is justified by allegations that there are more Soviet diplomats in the USA than of Americans in the USSR and that certain Soviet diplomats are engaged in espionage. No concrete facts are mentioned, however, to support these allegations. And then, properly speaking, the U.S. Administration obviously had no intention of aducing concrete proof. It only wanted to cloud Soviet-American relations with the help of such provocative attacks, cast aspersions on Soviet foreign policy, block accords to which the way was opened at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik.

As we said by Italian Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti, "We must not allow ourselves to be led astray by mutual accusations of espionage and restriction of diplomatic presence." "The problems are tremendous," the minister said, "but solutions to them exist and they must be sought for persistently while avoiding all traps laid by opponents of a dialogue."

FURTHER ON U.S. 'PROPAGANDA' EFFORTS ON REYKJAVIK

Kornilov Counters 'Lies'

LD221625 Moscow TASS in English 1524 GMT 22 Oct 86

["Understood Nothing and Learned Nothing" -- TASS take identifier]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- Political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The higher the wave of international indignation and protests against Washingtion's negative, obstructionist stand in Reykjavik the more vigorously and cunningly are the American authorities trying to camouflage their aggressive, militaristic policy, to delude public opinion. Their chosen method is lies, runaway lies, I would even say pathological lies.

It is a lie that Washington went to the meeting in the Icelandic capital with thoughts, as it is now contended, of strengthening peace and trust, of ensuring arms control because it was already on the eve of Reykjavik that the American Administration had done virtually everything to step up tension, to spoil and aggravate Soviet-American relations. How else can one qualify the deliberate whipping of the "spy mania" in the United States interlaced with rabid anti-Sovietism? How else can one qualify Washington's absolutely unlawful, provocative "demand" that the staff of the Soviet mission to the United Nations be sharply reduced?

It is a lie that already in Reykjavik the United States, "motivated by concern for peace", had made "exceptionally important", almost "epochal" proposals to curb the arms race.

In reality the American delegations came to the summit meeting with nothing in its political baggage but moth-eaten rubbish nobody needed. If the Reykjavik meeting has really earned a place in the annals of international relations as a meeting that succeeded in gaining much ground (in the search of ways) in questions of disarmament, this happened only thanks to the USSR's persistent and active position.

It was the Soviet Union and not the United States that proposed in Reykjavik a package of major measures the fulfillment of which, and this is now acknowledged throughout the world, would make it possible to start genuine advance towards a nuclear-free world.

It was the Soviet Union and not the United States that proposed a radical cut, by fifty per cent, of the deadliest of weapons -- strategic weapons -- with a view to eventually totally eliminating them.

Moscow and not Washington came out for cleansing European soil of medium-range nuclear weapons and showed readiness to settle the question of the future of medium-range missiles in Asia and missiles with a range less than a thousand kilometres.

There is no need to say how millions of people would heave a sigh of relief when whole mountains of nuclear-missile weapons would be scrapped.

It is a lie that the USSR is at fault for the failure in Reykjavik to reach a dramatic, historical result in the sphere of disarmament. The Soviet proposals contained a broad positive programme and an unprecedented readiness for compromise, for concessions on an equal basis. But they were confronted with a desire to "outplay the Russians" at all cost, with the hypocritical talk about disarmament while the real intent is not only to continue the arms race but to quickly spread the arms race to a new sphere -- outer space.

It is natural to ask -- how can one "sincerely" agree to the reduction of some types of weapons and in the same stride announce the development of plans of putting into service of other types of weapons, much more sophisticated and powerful ones at that? How can one square words about desire to stabilise the situation and the intent to wreck the timeless Soviet-American ABM treaty, which makes it possible somehow to restrain the arms race? The reaching of accords capable of working a veritable breakthrough was frutstrated precisely by the intent of the American leadership to achieve military superiority by means of SDI.

In 1984 the Pantheon publishing house in New York put out the book "There He Goes Again: R. Reagan's Reign of Error" by the American journalists Mark Green and Gail MacColl.

Noting that the President of the United States makes all information suit his ideological patterns the authors write further that if Reagan's pronouncements of the past 25 years were compared with authoritative sources it would transpire that on at least 300 occasions he had grossly distorted reality. These distortions, Green and MacColl write further, are used by way of six methods: Obvious exaggerations; deliberate ommission of facts important for the understanding of the given problem; statements deliberately couched in the style of jokes; use of juggled statistics; rejection of "unpleasant" facts; and finally open deceit.

As the occupant of the White House advertises today his supposedly "positive" stand in Reykjavik he obviously puts to use his "method number six."

In his time, when making a sordid anti-Soviet and anti-Communist speech at the 41st annual convention of the National Association of Evangelists, Ronald Reagan praised a "young father" from his home state of California who had openly declared that he would prefer his daughters to perish in the flames of a nuclear conflagration rather than "live under communism." Judging by everything even after Reykjavik the people in Washington have not understood anything or learned anything. So sounding from there now like a sinister echo are the tunes of that old cannibalistic concept: "Better to be atomised than communised" and therefore there is only one course to be pursued: To arm, arm and once again to arm -- contrary to reason, contrary to the imperative and grim realities of the nuclear epoch.

These militaristic, imperial ambitions of Washington, aggravated by its lies and shameless propaganda tricks, cannot but give rise to the most serious and growing alarm of the international public.

PRAVDA Hits Perle, Buchanan

PM221520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[Yu. Kuznetsov "Sketch": "'Good Morning, America!'"]

[Text] There is a saying among our people that the morning brings more light. Meaning that you can think more easily when your mind is fresh. But in the United States, it appears, they now have a slightly different saying. There, the morning brings more obscurity. That emerged from a television program in which two prominent Washington figures spoke -- Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle and White House Director of Communications P. Buchanan. The program was called "Good Morning, America!", but these gentlemen were so abstruse that the darkness of night seemed to fall before the viewers' eyes when they tried to follow their tortuous train of thought. The point is that Perle and Buchanan were expounding their (or rather, the White House's) version of the recent Reykjavik meeting. They were performing all kinds of contortions in order somehow to substantiate that version. Among the Washington administrators, for some reason, there was a lack of complete unanimity -- not to say elementary agreement -- on the question of how to regard the meeting and of how it ended. Some say it was a failure. Others, on the contrary, that it was a success. Others again, that it was a shining victory for Washington.

It is well known that variations of this kind require solid, strong logical backing. But here the backing was very fine and subtle. As subtle as can be. Yet it is sometimes said (again, among the people): "There is something fishy about too much subtlety."

In this connection the Washington propaganda agenda was bubbling over mainly with such questions as (a) who really wanted arms reductions in Reykjavik (and made corresponding proposals), and (b) who plotted against the talks and why?

Point (b) presented no difficulties. Under the present administration, it is as plain as daylight that in everything, always, and everywhere, yesterday, today, and in the future, "those Russians" are to blame. Point (a) is more complicated.

We must take another look at the variant readings in the sphere of Anglo-Russian vocabulary. In particular, the word "attribution" [pripiska]. On the banks of the Potomac, in recent days it has acquired its own special meaning. With the help and through the medium of this term, the astonished U.S. public are presented with a truly impressive composition of large-scale proposals on arms reduction submitted by... um... the U.S. Administration!

It appears that the administrators flung themselves wholeheartedly into striving to ensure that there were no interim agreements on missiles, no levels or sublevels of any kind, but radical steps, and so on, and so forth.

Fine. Let them make what attributions they like. At least this would be something plain to see, and for the common good.

Here, true, their own D. Regan rather dampened the impression of major unilateral U.S. initiatives. He was approached, as White House chief of staff, by NBC television. "As far as one can tell, much of what the Russians proposed in Iceland, including the major arms reduction and the elimination of medium-range missiles, was a surprise for you?" the correspondent asked.

And Regan replied hastily (it seems there is more than one pearl on the Washington scene): "Yes, perhaps, but I'm not sure. We were familiar with many of these proposals beforehand."

Oh, what a thing to say! How do well grounded administrators reply in such cases? Only like this:

"What Soviet proposals?! I know nothing about them! There were none, none, none..."

So why, one wonders in that case, did the Russians go to Reykjavik at all?

"It's obvious!" Perle and Buchanan declared, authoritatively and almost with one voice. "The Russians are terrified of our SDI. So they came to bury it."

Buchanan reported the stupefying, bloodcurdling details of how Moscow supposedly demanded: "Kill SDI in its cradle!"

Fortunately the administration was, as always, on the alert, and prevented the infanticide. Of course, it had to sacrifice the agreements which had already been prepared on radical arms reduction. What of it?

Stop, the reader cries, after all, it was only a question of a proposal to restrict the SDI program to laboratory research. Try proving that to P. Buchanan. I bet you won't succeed. He and many (alas!) of his colleagues, especially the seniors, are simply obsessed with the idea of covering the sky with a three-tier shield, so that the wily enemy would think the sky was going to fall on his head!

But is the game worth the candle? The administrators, especially the senior ones, don't want to think about that.

Especially since it will be other Americans who pay, and still others who rake it in. Those who are prepared to set fire to the whole planet for the sake of an order running into trillions of dollars, a fairy-tale order -- even for the empire of gold.

"It's a gold mine!" the weapon company managers and bankers whisper delightedly in California, Texas, and Nevada.

"Have you heard what Mr Adelman, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said the other day?"

"What? What? What?"

"This: 'Renouncing SDI would mean killing the goose that lays the golden eggs!'"

So there you have it. "Golden eggs" for the monopolists. And for ordinary people? Only the threat of war, as many people, even in America, realize. So much for "good morning."

KOHL'S U.S. DISCUSSIONS ON REYKJAVIK NOT 'EASY'

LD212135 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Commentary by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Excerpt] Official negotiations have begun in Washington between FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl and leaders of the U.S. Administration. Here is a commentary on the recent news. Over to Eduard Mnatskanov, our political observer:

[Mnatsakanov] The interest shown in the FRG chancellor's Washington visit has, I believe, been generated by two points. It is the first visit to Washington by the leader of a major West European country since the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik. And, of course, its outcome will be at the center of attention during the talks. In addition, British Prime Minister Thatcher has, so it has become known, empowered Kohl to speak on her behalf in the U.S. capital. Thus, we are talking about a serious discussion of the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. meeting between the governments of the United States and its closest NATO allies. It is to be supposed that this discussion will not be an easy one. Neither in Bonn, nor in London, nor in the capitals of other West European countries is the disillusionment with the Washington administration's position on the cardinal issues of modern times hidden. Particular irritation is caused by the fact that a solution to these problems was blocked by Reagan's Star Wars program, a program with which, as the British OBSERVER delicately put it, the Europeans have never been in total sympathy. [passage omitted]

Ignatyev on SDI Stance

LD221502 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Washington October 22 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan received Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl of West Germany, who is here on an official visit, at the White House Tuesday. A high-ranking administration spokesman said that the Reykjavik meeting had been, of course, the first and dominant theme of the discussion. Judging by statements by American officials, during the White House talks Kohl supported the position the U.S. Administration had taken in Reykjavik. He also voiced his government's backing once again for the "Star Wars" program and did not call on the U.S. President to change the administration's attitude to the SDI. At the same time, ABC television reported, he had privately urged the President to limit SDI-related work in keeping with the narrow interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

A high-ranking White House official said after the talks that the West German side had voiced the opinion that the treaty was important and should be observed. This position taken by Bonn is explained, among other things, by the need for political maneuvering ahead of the forthcoming parliamentary elections in West Germany next January.

IZVESTIYA CITES PRC REACTION TO REYKJAVIK

PM221041 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "China's Reaction"]

[Text] Beijing -- The Chinese press, which attentively followed the preparations for and the holding of the Reykjavik meeting, has recently been discussing its results in detail.

XINHUA commentaries from Moscow and Washington and reports from Reykjavik and other capitals set out the Soviet and U.S. positions and publish reactions and assessments from various countries.

In particular, BEIJING RIBAO, which set out the content of M.S. Gorbachev's press conference most fully, shared his view that the Soviet side had brought to Reykjavik a whole package of proposals including a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms, the elimination of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe, three-way verification [kontrol], and a commitment on the part of the sides not to exercise the right to depart from the ABM Treaty for 10 years. The newspaper stressed M.S. Gorbachev's proposal to think about the situation which has emerged since the Reykjavik meeting and return to the topic, overcoming the things that separate the USSR and the United States.

Answering journalists' questions at a press briefing about how the Chinese Government views the results of the U.S. -Soviet meeting, a PRC Foreign Ministry Press Department spokesman stated: "We have taken note of the fact that the U.S.-Soviet meeting did not lead to agreement. We have always advocated dialogue between the United States and the Soviet Union. Dialogue is always better than confrontation. We hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will continue the dialogue."

AID TO PRC IN TRANSMISSION LINE CONSTRUCTION

LD230245 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Beijing, 22 Oct -- TASS correspondent Grigoriy Arslanov reports:

In accordance with an intergovernmental agreement, the Soviet Union will provide assistance to the PRC in the construction of two new electric transmission lines. The contracts, signed here today, envision deliveries of Soviet equipment and materials with total value of 138.6 million Swiss francs for the construction of transformer substations and electrical transmission lines with a capacity of 500 kilovolts. One of them will link a number of towns in the northeast of the country; the other will link Shanxi Province with the town of Tianjin. The total length of the lines will amount to 1,250 km.

CONTINUED REPORTAGE OF KIM IL-SONG MOSCOW VISIT

Greeted by Gromyko, Officials

LD221412 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- Today Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has arrived in Moscow on a friendly visit at the invitation of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

At the airport the leader of the People's Korea was welcome by Andrey Gromyko of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Yego Ligachev, member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials.

Welcomed by Gorbachev

LD221446 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- The welcoming ceremony for Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea, president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (D.P.R.K.), was held at the St. George Hall of the Grand Kremlin Palace right after Kim Il-song's arrival from the Vnukovo Airport.

The leader of the D.P.R.K. was welcomed by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Nikolay Ryzhkov, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., was present during the ceremony.

Visits National Monuments

LD231143 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 23 Oct 86

[Text] Today, Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and DPRK President, visited the mausoleum of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and laid a wreath. He honored the memory of the creator of the CPSU and the founder of the first socialist state in the world by a minute of silence. The guest also paid a respectful tribute to the Soviet soldiers fallen in the struggle against fascism. He laid a wreath to the Grave of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Hall.

The DPRK leader was accompanied by Comrade Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrade Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and other offficials.

RADIO COMMENTARY HAILS SOVIET-DPRK FRIENDSHIP

SK230524 Moscow International Service in Korean 1130 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Commentary by unidentified station commentator]

[Text] The Soviet Union and socialist Korea are successfully developing and improving their mutual relations. The Treaty of Cooperation and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the DPRK serves as a reliable basis for a fraternal alliance between the peoples of the two countries.

We should point out that regular meetings between the activists of the party and state have contributed to deepening the friendship and mutual assistance between the two fraternal socialist countries. The visit to the Soviet Union in May 1984 by the DPRK party and state delegation led by Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK, was a great occasion in the relations between the Soviet Union and Korea.

The agreement reached at the high-level talks during the visit by the delegation gave stimulation to cooperation between the two countries in politics, trade, the economy and culture and contributed to active exchanges and contacts between party and state organizations as well as public organizations. (?Various) agreements have been made in recent years between our two countries. They have strengthened relations in the relevant fields and the legal basis of such relations, and opened new prospects for development of the relations in the trade, economic, scientific and technological fields. They also defined the scope of cooperation during the current 5-year plan period.

According to these documents, the Soviet Union will provide assistance to People's Korea in the near future in building and renovating a series of large-scale facilities of the national economy. During the 1986-90 period, the amount of trade between the Soviet Union and Korea will reach 8 billion rubles, an increase of more than double from the past 5 years. The Soviet Union will supply crude oil and crude oil goods, coke, and consumer goods, and socialist Korea will export magnesia clinker, light industrial products, and nonferrous and ferrous metal to the Soviet Union.

The relations between the Soviet Union and Korea have been strengthened through their cooperation in the international arena. Under the present complex international situation, the consistent acts shown in the struggle against the aggressive lines of the United States, its allies and the imperialist circles and against the arms race are of special significance. The DPRK has fully supported the Soviet efforts made to maintain a balance in nuclear and military strategy and to restrict the nuclear arms race as well as the Soviet position in the talks in Geneva and in the high-level USSR-U.S. talks in Reykjavik.

Just like the other fraternal socialist countries, People's Korea has expressed solidarity with the Soviet plan to (?abolish) nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century and to postpone nuclear testing until 1 January 1987. The Soviet plan to consolidate peace and security in Asia and the Pacific area, which was revealed by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his address in Vladivostok, has evoked a broad range of reaction in socialist Korea.

The peace-loving proposals which reflect the Korean people's desire to normalize the situation on the Korean peninsula are making a contribution in implementing this plan.

The Korean people's just struggle for the peaceful reunification of the fatherland and for the sound situation on the Korean peninsula enjoys a broad range of support from the Soviet people, the fraternal socialist countries, and progressive social circles throughout the world.

The DPRK is advancing shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Union in socialist construction and in the struggle against those who oppose peace and security in Asia and in the world. The friendship and international solidarity between our two countries has been strengthened through the struggle for peace.

MOSCOW WARNS JAPAN NOT TO DISTORT WORLD WAR II

OW210516 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Yuriy Afonin commentary]

[Text] Nineteen October marks 30 years since the signing of the USSR-Japan joint statement and the normalization of relations between the two countries. This historic event opened up a new stage in the history of USSR-Japan relations. In this connection, commentator Yuriy Afonin writes:

It is difficult to give a simple appraisal of the roads taken by the two countries in the past 3 decades. There is, on the one hand, the indisputable fact that a great step forward has been made in the development of relations between the two countries during this period. Various documents, including the trade treaty and the agreement on consular affairs and on air routes in the Far East, were major steps taken to establish a resolute, legal basis for the bilateral relations. On the other hand, however, it is quite obvious that some issues have not been completely settled. No treaty has been signed between the USSR and Japan on the basic principles for the bilateral relations in various fields.

On the whole, USSR-Japan relations have developed progressively but certainly not evenly. There was a period of stagnation, and there was even retrogression in some areas of bilateral trade. It can be said there is still fairly good potential, on the whole, for promoting bilateral relations. One of the most important tasks now is to bring this potential into fullest play. It is precisely now that some optimistic and favorable conditions have been created for achieving these tasks.

There has been a remarkable turn for the better in USSR-Japan relations which were stalemated in the early 1980's. The turn for the better was most conspicuous in the exchange of official visits by the foreign ministers of the two countries in the first half of this year. New agreements have been signed on eliminating double taxation, on cultural exchanges, and on other issues. The Japanese industrial fair, Japan 1986, which opened in Moscow -- the first of its kind in 16 years -- is the common symbol of the organizations of the two countries engaged in the promotion of economic relations. It is expected that the fifth USSR-Japan roundtable conference scheduled to open in Tokyo in early December will study measures to further promote bilateral relations in various fields.

The event that most significantly indicated a turn for the better in bilateral relations was the accord reached on the exchange of visits by top-level leaders.

The visit to Japan by CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev is now on the agenda of USSR-Japan relations. The development of USSR-Japan relations in the future requires an overall promotion of cooperation based on mutual benefit. This complies not only with the interests of the peoples of the two countries but also with interests of the current world as a whole.

Under the current complicated circumstances, the most important task of top priority in cooperation between the two countries should be common efforts to create a nuclear-free world and to eventually and completely eliminate the nuclear danger threatening mankind. This is also what the Japanese people, the victims of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedies, want to achieve most.

The extensive Soviet proposals for abolishing nuclear weapons can be used as good foundations for cooperation between the two countries in the international arena. The advanced science and technology and also the economic power of the USSR and Japan have opened up bright prospects for cooperation between the two countries in the new fields, different from those fields in the past. General Secretary Gorbachev touched on some of these fields in his July Vladivostok speech. These fields include space and the oceans. It is precisely in these fields that the foundations for genuine, peaceful relations of mutual benefit among peoples of various countries in the 21st Century can be established.

In fact, there are great possibilities for further promoting USSR-Japan relations, and it is essential that this opportunity is not missed. If there is no attempt to distort the outcome of or the borders resulting from World War II, the USSR is determined to cooperate in making fruitful achievements in the promotion of USSR-Japan relations based on the principle of reciprocity.

BRIEFS

TOKYO SPACE SYMPOSIUM -- Tokyo October 22 TASS -- "Our Space" is the title of the international symposium on questions of cosmonautics and exploration of outer space, which has opened in the Japanese capital today. Attending the symposium are representatives of five countries -- Japan, the Soviet Union, the USA, Britain and France, among them pilot cosmonaut of the USSR, twice Hero of the Soviet Union Aleksey Leonov. The symposium covers the objectives of international cooperation in the field of peaceful space exploration and prevention of militarization of outer space. Addressing the participants in the symposium on behalf of its organizers, Makio Ito, vice-president of the newspaper "ASAHI," one or Japan's biggest, pointed to the inadmissibility of the placing of military systems in outer space and declared for the drawing up and implementation of international programmes for the exploration of outer space, meeting the interests of the entire mankind. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 22 Oct 86 LD]

POLISH PAPER INTERVIEWS RYZHKOV IN WARSAW

AU210949 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 16 Oct 86 pp 1, 2

[Interview given by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Nikolay Ryzhkov to Jerzy Majka, TRYBUNA LUDU chief editor: "The CPSU and PZPR Congresses Formulated Many Joint Programmatic Tasks to Accelerate Economic Development" -- in Warsaw on 15 October]

[Text] [Majka] Six months ago the 27th CPSU Congress formulated the strategy of accelerating the USSR's socioeconomic development. This bold program made a great impression on the Polish people. Could you tell us about the implementation of the congress resolutions?

[Ryzhkov] As you know the strategy of accelerating socioeconomic development seeks to overcome the negative trends of the seventies and of the beginning of the eighties and to ensure a decidedly intensive development, leading achievements in scientific-technological progress, and better quality and effectiveness of all work.

When we drew up the plan for the 12th 5-year period, which is the first and extremely responsible phase of the implementation of the party's long-term strategy, we decided that precisely these tasks were the most important. It was our view that precisely the 12th 5-Year Plan should prove to be momentous in every regard.

It is obvious that the accomplishment of the 5-year plan tasks posed by the 27th CPSU Congress in terms of specific figures is impossible if we employ the old methods. We need a novel approach. We must give free rein to the masses' creativeness and initiative and make genuinely revolutionary changes.

That is why in 1984 we began searching for improvements in management, planning, and the entire economic mechanism, primarily in industry as a leading branch of the national economy.

The methods tried out during this experiment will be used by all industrial associations and enterprises as of 1987. Farming, transportation, and trade will operate under new conditions. We are beginning to consistently employ the new system in building trades and in nonproduction sectors.

We are going even further. We continue to implement a reform the aim of which is to make associations and enterprises fully responsible for their own finances. On the one hand, this provides room for initiative and socialist resourcefulness in associations and enterprises and, on the other, increases one's responsibility for achieving good production results illustrated by the profits in rubles.

It should be stressed that the transformation of the economic mechanism is taking place in our country on strictly socialist principles and that the expansion of the economic independence of enterprises under new conditions goes hand in hand with efforts to strengthen the centralized planned management of the economy. The long-term economic norms are one of the reasons that make us hope that this optimal relationship can be assured It is our task to maximally exploit the superiority of the socialist economic system and to most fully utilize the potential of the national economy based on the people's large-scale commitment.

The reform may produce results only if it is carried out comprehensively and if it covers not only associations and enterprises, but also all the other management echelons and all the sectors of the planning, fiscal, and economic activities.

With this in mind, we continue to consistently transform the organizational structures of national economic management and to improve the forms and methods of planning, the flow of materials and technical equipment, the movement of prices, and the supply of funds and loans.

In recent months we have created two new bodies to manage large intersector combines in the field of machine-building, fuels and energy, industrial agriculture, and construction. We continue improve our foreign contacts. The powers and responsibilities of the people's soviets with regard to the comprehensive socioeconomic develpment of their regions have been greatly expanded.

What is most important and should be solved at once is to transform awareness of cadres and to ensure that the new principles of economic management are thoroughly mastered by every worker.

The results of this year's development of the national economy prove that this transformation is beginning to bear fruit. The process of repairing our economy is expanding.

In the first 9 months of this year the increase in industrial production amounted to 5.2 percent compared with the corresponding period last year. This was in excess of the annual tasks (4.3 percent). Farming, transportation, construction, and other sectors worked at a faster pace than previously, and the role of the intensive factors in development was intensified. The social program continues to be favorably implemented.

At the same time, we realize that we are just at the beginning of a long and difficult road and that we must now solve even more complicated tasks. We will have to exploit such profound factors in economic growth as scientific-technological progress and the structural transformation of the national economy.

[Majka] Soviet-Polish economic and scientific-technical cooperation has recently shifted over to developing new forms of integration. How do you evaluate this cooperation and its role in accomplishing the relevant resolutions of the CPSU and PZPR congresses?

[Ryzhkov] Anyone familiar with the materials of the 27th CPSU and the 10th PZPR Congresses was able to find out that the concepts of our congresses are full of joint programmatic economic tasks. They are concepts of speeding up economic development in order to increase efficiency. This means internsification via technological progress, modernization of the national economy, and the transformation of its structure. Both in the USSR and in Poland all this is governed by the main purpose of raising the people's living standards.

Both in our country and the PPR the structural transformation of the economy will be carried out through technological progress and the most modern technologies. It is obvious that it is desirable to pool efforts and expand cooperation along the key lines of the most important problems and accomplishing joint tasks.

The external situation also dictates the need to pool efforts. As you know our countries do not exist in isolation and are first of all members of the economic system of the socialist community, which does not isolate itself from the external world. On the contrary, it seeks extensive cooperation with it, but this cooperation must involve equality and mutual advantages. That is why all socialist countries are now especially interested in speeding up the rate of technological progress and in raising the technical standards and quality of production and its competitiveness.

Life has convinced us that the socialist countries are able to effectively join world cooperation on equal principles only as an integrated system. Our economic relations within the community should become a model of close integration. In the long run this system will not only ensure for us mutual supplies of raw materials and fuels, but also will help us meet wide-ranging needs for the products of the machine building industry, chemistry, and modern technology.

Speaking of the most modern production, coproduction, and production specialization, we should see that a new mechanism should be created to facilitate such links. This mechanism will provide for joint international enterprises and accociations and for the development of direct relations among enterprises in our countries.

At present the most extensive production cooperation exists between the USSR and Poland if we take into account all the socialist countries. When the 1984 long-term program for developing Soviet-Polish economic and scientific-technical cooperation up to the year 2000 was signed, almost 50 Soviet and 50 Polish enterprises were linked by direct cooperation. Now there are 150 such enterprises in each country. Today we also signed a new accord on direct production and scientific-technical cooperation. This accord provides for doubling the number of enterprises engaged in direct cooperation. We will also use the institution of joint enterprises in order to solve the problems of technological modernization and to accelerate technological progress.

We have devoted much attention to this issue during our present visit and we have decided to set up five Polish-Soviet enterprises with a common capital in Poland. The number of such enterprises will go up. The increasing importance of technological progress opens up great opportunities for developing such cooperation. We will seek to use these enterprises for our greatest joint benefit.

[Majka] The USSR recently adopted important resolutions on the further development of and improvements in economic activities with foreign countries. How far will this help extend the USSR's economic relations with foreign countries! In particular, how far will this help intensify socialist economic integration!

[Ryzhkov] You are right in saying that these resolutions are important bacause they are really of great significance for solving our demestic tasks, for developing the cooperation among socialist countries, and for promoting the cooperation between the Soviet economy and the capitalist economies.

The crux of these resolutions is that they commit producers to foreign trade in a direct way and that they create economic conditions that boost the interest of the enterprises concerned in foreign trade and increased exports. In exchange for increasing exports these enterprises are able to develop their production, raise technological standards, and improve workers material conditions.

It goes without saying that these new resolutions take into account the special significance of the economic relations with the fraternal socialist countries. We regard these relations as priority relations, and this is guaranteed by a wide-ranging system of economic, legal, and organizational measures. While raising the effectiveness of our economic relations and cooperation, the new system observes the principles that are proper for the economic relations among socialist countries. These principles stress equality, the comprehensive understanding for mutual interests, needs, and potentials, as well as mutual benefits and assistance.

It says:

"Dear comrades!

"On my way to the DPRK, the PRC, and Mongolia for an official friendly visit, I sent cordial greetings to you and to all the Soviet people.

"My visit to these socialist countries will further deepen the traditional relations of friendship and mutually advantageous cooperation. I note with great satisfaction the complete unity of views on fundamental questions of socialist building and the struggle for peace which exists between the SED and the GDR and the CPSU and the USSR.

"I am profoundly convinced that in the course of resolving common tasks our fraternal alliance will become even more durable and fruitful."

HONECKER STOPS IN IRKUTSK ON WAY TO DPRK

AU211301 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 20 Oct 86 p 2

[Text] Irkutsk (ADN) -- At a stopover in Irkutsk Erich Honecker, SED Central Commitee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman, was cordially welcomed at the airport by V.I. Sitnikov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Oblast CPSU Committee, and A.M. Kovalchuk, chairman of the Irkutsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, as well as by other prominent figures of Irkutsk Oblast. Also present was Egon Winkelmann, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the GDR to the USSR.

V.I. Sitnikov gave a breakfast in honor of Erich Honecker and the members of his official entourage, which took place in a cordial and friendly atmosphere. Erich Honecker and V.I. Sitnikov briefed each other on the implementation of the resolutions of the 11th SED Congress and the 27th CPSU Congress and praised the development of the close fraternal cooperation between both states and peoples, in particular the partnership relations between Irkutsk Oblast and the Karl-Marx-Stadt Bezirk.

SOVIET AMBASSADOR RECEIVES U.S. ENVOY TO FRG

LD181933 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1804 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Text] Berlin, 18 Oct (TASS/ADN) -- Vyacheslav Kochemasov, USSR ambassador to the GDR, today received Richard Burt, U.S. ambassador to the FRG, in his capacity as chief of the U.S. military administration of Berlin (West). Questions of mutual interest were discussed during the talk, which proceeded in a businesslike and open atmosphere.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON VISIT OF DENMARK'S SCHLUTER

Schluter Kremlin Dinner Speech

LD202055 Moscow TASS in English 2032 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- "Our countries have proved their ability to coexist in the atmosphere of goodneighbourliness and mutual respect, despite the different places they occupy on the political and ideological map of the world", Danish prime minister Poul Schluter said at a dinner in the Kremlin given by the Soviet Government for him and his wife.

"Our current visit", the guest of the Soviet Government went on, "passes in the shadow of certain disappointment which, in my opinion, is felt above all in Europe, the disappointment over the fact that the meeting between President of the United States Ronald Reagan and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev apparently has not led to any concrete, direct results. There is no agreement even about the date of the summit meeting on whose holding the two leaders agreed in the current year. That meeting was to be followed by a new one in 1987. I will make no secret of the fact that the Danish side shares the present disappointment and strongly urges the two great powers to continue the dialogue they have started. It is the destinies of the whole world and not just relations between the United States and the Soviet Union that are the point of the matter. I do not think, however, that the verdict of history will describe the Reykjavik meeting as a failure".

"The expectations raised by the meeting in Reykjavik have not been justified. What is needed now is that we should not yield to disappointment and should continue an open dialogue through all the existing channels. We proceed from the premise that the Geneva talks will be continued. We also count on the continuation and further development of what we describe as the Helsinki process in the period ahead. This process proved its value and importance, creating the framework for a very candid exchange of opinions. We should not pretend that there are no fundamental differences between countries and peoples in world outlook and ideas about aims of development. This is why it is absolutely necessary to hold a dialogue and strive to achieve mutual understanding and mutual respect by talks".

Touching upon questions of bilateral relations, Poul Schluter voiced satisfaction with their favorable development and expressed the hope that they will continue developing for the benefit of Denmark and the USSR.

Schluter on Reykjavik Talks

LD221106 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- "We see our visit to the Soviet Union as part of the continuing dialogue between Denmark and the USSR and between countries of West and East, a dialogue which is ever more essential in this complicated international situation," Prime Minister Poul Schluter of Denmark told a news conference at the Press Center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry here today.

"I have the impression that disappointment with the absence of concrete accords in Reykjavik is not the final reaction of the Soviet side," he said.

"The Soviet side has reaffirmed that its proposals made both before Reykjavik and during the summit meeting there remain on the negotiating table and the Geneva process is continuing," he added.

"The Reykjavik meeting has been more likely a success than a failure. The Reykjavik meeting has not been in vain," Schluter said. "In the future this could be a useful overture to further talks."

"I find it very constructive that the Soviet side made its proposals early during the talks and then explained them to the broad public. I am firmly convinced it is this that has helped conduct positive talks in Reykjavik," he said.

"It was the initiative of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to hold that meeting and I think it was a wise idea," the Danish prime minister said.

"Representing a nuclear-free country, I voiced my admiration of the prospect of a nuclear-free world. In it we should live on a new security basis," Schluter said.

"I believe that this visit has helped improve the understanding of our positions and the further development of relations between the two countries. We are neighbors and are only divided by the Baltic Sea," he said.

The Danish prime minister said five Northern European countries did not have nuclear weapons in their territories and that was a stabilizing factor for peace.

He said that his government was opposed to outer space militarization.

'Sharp' Talks on Human Rights

AU221252 Paris AFP in English 1246 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow, Oct 22 (AFP) -- Danish Prime Minister Poul Schluter said here Wednesday he had raised the cases of divided Danish-Soviet families during talks at the Kremlin this week, and described his talks on human rights issues with the Soviet leadership as "sharp."

Mr. Schluter, who arrived on Monday and whose talks included a meeting with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on Tuesday, told a press conference that his meetings had covered "the various conceptions of human rights in East and West." He had raised the question of "five unresolved Danish-Soviet cases of family reunification and family visits," and had made a "strong appeal for the solution of these."

The discussions were "sharp" and "I did not get any precise answer," he said, adding: "We will see what happens."

Mr. Schluter had also "particularly stressed the importance of the human dimension of the Helsinki Final Act."

He had raised the Danish idea of the establishment of "what we call a semi-permanent conference within this human dimension."

The Danish premier, briefed by Mr. Gorbachev on the Reykjavik summit, said he believed the superpowers had not had enough time to "analyse all philosophical and technical and strategic issues involved in the SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) project".

Soviet insistence that the United States restrict SDI research to the laboratory led to the breakdown of the talks as far reaching accords on reducing intermediate and strategic missiles were on the verge of being agreed.

Mr. Schluter, the first West European leader to meet Mr. Gorbachev since the summit, said he had the impression that the "obvious disappointment at the lack of concrete negotiated result in Reykjavik is not the final reaction by the Soviet side."

"They reaffirmed that their proposals before and in Reykjavik remained on the negotiating table," and that the Geneva process was continuing, he said.

On other issues, Mr. Schluter had told the Soviet leadership that its proposals for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe would have to be "recognized and guaranteed by both superpowers," had pointed out the need for a "political solution" in Afghanistan, and hoped there would could be new cooperation between the European Economic Community (EEC) and its communist equivalent, COMECON.

TASS Cites Danish Press Agency

LD221506 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Copenhagen October 22 TASS -- Reporting yesterday's conversation between Mikhail Gorbachev and Poul Schluter, the Danish news agency RITZAUS BUREAU quoted the Danish head of government as saying that it had been "most informal and candid".

The news agency said Mikhail Gorbachev had briefed Poul Schluter in detail about the results of his meeting with U.S. President in Reykjavik. RITZAUS BUREAU added that the briefing had showed no signal of any change in the Soviet approaches to disarmament issues.

It quoted Poul Schluter as saying that the conversation had begun with a heated ideological debate and that had livened up the conversation significantly.

By its nature it had clearly been non-diplomatic but Mikhail Gorbachev, RITZAUS BUREAU said further, had made a strong impression on Poul Schluter who had described him as "an energetic and dynamic leader of great ability and personal charisma".

RITZAUS BUREAU quoted excerpts from the TASS account of Mikhail Gorbachev's conversation with Poul Schluter, citing the Soviet leader's denial of the claim that the SDI issue had only been raised towards the end of the Reykjavik meeting.

The news agency also singled out Mikhail Gorbachev's reminder of the Budapest initiative of the Warsaw Treaty countries and stressed his words about the inadmissibility of interference in the internal affairs of socialist states.

Schluter Leaves for Tbilisi

LD221403 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- The Danish Prime Minister Poul Schluter and his wife left Moscow for Tbilisi today.

At the airport the prime minister and his wife were seen off by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Ryzhkov and his wife, and other officials.

Poul Schluter has been staying in the USSR since Monday on an official visit at the Soviet Government's invitation.

GROMYKO DISCUSSES REYKJAVIK WITH VISITING SWISS

LD172026 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1805 GMT 17 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow, 17 Oct (TASS) -- Andrey Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, received a delegation in the Kremlin today of the Federal Assembly of the Swiss confideration headed by Martin Budi, the national council chairman.

The attention of the Swiss side was drawn to the complex of initiative proposed by Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central committee general secretary, the implementation of which would allow mankind to be rid of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century.

At the same time special attention was turned to the outcome of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, where the solutions for the problems of strategic offensive weapons, medium range missiles, the treaty on limitation of the anti ballistic defense systems (ABM), and banning of nuclear tests was a part of the Soviet proposal package. The Soviet side has stressed that harmonized provisions were not embodied in concrete accords binding for both parties due to the stubborn unwillingness of the U.S. Administration to renounce the program for militarization of space (SDI). The task now is to double or treble efforts in the struggle for peace due to the responsiblity that the two powers will bear for future conditions in the world.

The Soviet and the Swiss parties have agreed that thanks to the new approach based on political realism and the feeling of responsibility, it was possible to succeed atthe Stockholm conference on the measures for strengthening trust, security, and disarmament in Europe. The successful conclusion of this conference creates a favorable ground for conducting the next meeting in Vienna in a constructive and businesslike spirit. As before, Andrey Gromyko has pointed out that neutral and nonaligned countries may play a considerable part at the new conference.

ENVOY TO UAE COMMENTS ON SOVIET ARMS TO IRAQ

LD231057 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0953 GMT 23 Oct 86

[Text] Abu Dhabi, 23 Oct (KUNA) -- A senior Soviet diplomat, in two interviews published here today, has revealed that his country, in its attempts to end the Iraq-Iran war, has made contacts not only with the two parties involved in the conflict, but also with the Islamic states, the Arab League, India, European leaders, and even the Americans, in an attempt to mediate between the two combatants. All efforts, however, have failed. The first [as received] ambassador of the Soviet Union to the UAE, Feliks Nikolayevich Fedotov, in two interviews with AL-ITTIHAD and AL KHALIJ, described the Iraq-Iran war as an international tragedy the continuation of which serves only those who have vested interests in it and that his country, right from the very beginning, has called on the two sides to halt the war. He added that this war does not serve the security interests in the Gulf area. He pointed out that statistics have shown that the number of people who so far have been lost on both sides totals about 1 million. He said civilian installations, public utilities, and oil storage tanks are being destroyed.

This war, he added, is a fire which could provide foreign forces with the pretext to intervene. He said that the harm of this war was not confined to the interests of the peoples of Iraq and Iran. The war constitutes a danger to the entire area, hence the Soviet Union's attitude which has said that this conflict must be diverted into a political channel. He said "we regard this war as a crime which should end immediately. Frankly speaking, had it not been for our friendship with Iraq and the Soviet arms supplies to Iraq the matter would have been extremely difficult." He added: "I am not revealing a secret when I say that we supply Iraq with Soviet weapons because there is a defense pact with Iraq which was signed some years ago, before the beginning of the war with Iran."

He reaffirmed anew his country's attitued vis-a-vis the necessity to safeguard international navigation in the Gulf, and the necessity to prevent the introduction of nuclear weapons into the area, and not to permit the establishment of foreign bases there.

PRAVDA REPORTS ON 'TERRORIST' WAILING WALL ATTACK

PM201419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Oct 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Near East: Explosions Thundering"]

[Text] Tel Aviv radio has reported that three grenades were thrown into a crowd after a swearing-in ceremony for Israeli recruits at the wailing wall in Jerusalem. One person was killed and 68 were injured. Most of the casualties were soldiers.

The people who carried out the terrorist act managed to escape. The Israeli police and security forces have started rounding up Palestinians. About 30 people have been arrested. Bridges crossing the River Jordan from occupied Palestinian areas into Jordan have been closed to traffic.

Several organizations have all claimed responsibility for this act.

In its evening news bulletin a Lebanese radio station reported a new Israeli air raid on Sidon. The Palestinian refugee camp of al-Miyah wa Miyah has been bombed.

The aggressors suffered losses when they encountered air defenses. One aircraft was shot down. It is reported that two Israeli airmen ejected and were taken prisoner.

GORBACHEV, OTHERS SIGN MACHEL CONDOLENCE BOOK

LD230841 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0807 GMT 23 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Today, Comrades Gorbachev, Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze, and Dobrynin visited the Embassy of the People's Republic of Mozambique in the USSR in connection with the tragic death of Marshal Samora Moises Machel, chairman of the FRELIMO party and president of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

With a minute of silence, they honored the memory of the prominent leader of the national liberation movement, African statesman, politician, and a great friend of the Soviet Union.

The leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet State signed the book of condolences.

PRAVDA CARRIES DECLARATION WITH BURKINA FASO

LD131852 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

["Joint Soviet-Burkinabe Declaration" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Captain Thomas Sankara, chairman of the National Council of the Revolution (NCR), president and head of government of Burkina Faso, was in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit from 6-12 October at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government.

A comradely conversation took place between Capt. T. Sankara, chairman of the National Council of the Revolution, and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during which the leaders of the two countries exchanged views on key issues relating to the international situation and Soviet-Burkinabe cooperation. It was noted that the personal contacts that had taken place would serve to increase the overall potential of the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Burkina Faso.

Constructive talks were also held, and were headed by A.A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Capt. T. Sankara, chairman of the National Council of the Revolution, president and head of Government of Burkina Faso.

Taking into account the conversation and talks that have taken place, the USSR and Burkina Faso;

Considering that the development and strengthening of friendship and cooperation between them meet the vital interests of the people of both countries, serve the cause of consolidating peace and security in Africa and throughout the world;

Taking as a basis the wide coincidence of views on major international problems and striving to further a radical improvement in the situation in the world, the removal of the threat of nuclear war, a halt to the arms race, a strengthening of national independence and the sovereignty of states, the strict respect for the rights of all peoples to determine independently the path of their development without interference from outside;

Coming out in favor of the unity of all progressive forces in the struggle for peace, freedom, national independence and social progress;

Being devoted to the cause of fighting imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism and apartheid;

Recognizing the urgent need for reorganization on an equitable and fair basis of the whole complex of international economic relations and for the setting up of a new world economic order and guarantees for the economic secirity of all countries;

Confirming their loyalty to the goals and principles of the UN Charter,

Declare:

I. The USSR and Burkina Faso will in the interest of the people of both countries develop and deepen the relations of friendship and cooperation that exist between them in the political, economic, scientific, technical, and cultural spheres on the basis of full respect for sovereignty and national independence, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and mutual gain. They will further the development and expansion of contacts and cooperation between state bodies, political, professional, youth, women's and other public organizations, and cultural and scientific institutions.

II. The USSR and Burkina Faso are deeply anxious about the continuing growth in international tension as a result of the policies of aggression, confrontation, and interference being pursued by imperialist circles. They condemn the continuation of the arms race and its extension into space.

The sides share the common opinion that at the present crucial stage of world development, more than ever before, there is a need for decisive action and concrete steps aimed at genuine disarmament and at liberating mankind from the threat of nuclear annihilation. The Burkinabe side welcomes the entire plan forwarded by the Soviet Union for the complete liquidation of mass destruction weapons by the end of this century, and the introduction and repeated extension by it of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union supports the nonaligned policy, and that of solidardity with the national liberation struggle of peoples being pursued by Burkina Faso, valuing its contribution to strengthening peace and international security.

The USSR and Burkina Faso will consistently promote the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security, taking in the military, political, economic and humanitarian spheres; strive for peaceful coexistence to become a universal principle in international relations.

The sides are convinced that there can be no detached observers in the struggle for peace against the militarists plans of imperialism. In this cause, which is vitally important for mankind, the contribution of all countries, without exception, is valuable. It is the historical duty of people to do everything possible in the name of ensuring a peaceful future for mankind, and creating favourable conditions for universal progress and prosperity.

III. The preservation and dangerous exacerbation of conflicts in Africa and other regions of the world arouse the serious anxiety of both sides. They confirm unchangeable solidarity with the people of the "frontline" states of South Africa, Libya, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Lebanon, the Arab peoples of Palestine, and other people who are resisting imperialist, racist, and Israeli aggression.

The sides will cooperate in every way possible with each other and with other states to support the courageous struggle by these people aimed at achieving peace and security. They favor a fair political settlement to regional conflicts: They favor all disputes between states being resolved through peaceful means, in accordance with the UN Charter, and the universally recognized standards of international law. In the opinion of the two sides, the settlement of the seats of tension that persist on such a basis would facilitate an improvement in the international climate, the strengthening of peace and universal security, and the expansion of trust and cooperation between states. In this context the USSR evaluates highly the efforts being undertaken by fraternal Burkina Faso and the Republic of Mali to achieve a peaceful settlement of the border conflict between them.

IV. The USSR and Burkina Faso note with satisfaction the growth of the positive role played in world affairs by the Nonaligned Movement and its active stance on issues relating to the struggle for peace and disarmament and for the liberation of the people from colonial and neocolonial dependence. This is reflected in the important decisions of the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaliagned Countries in Harare.

They highly assess the contribution made by the Organization of African Unity to the struggle to eliminate colonialism and racism, to reinforce African countries' political and economic independence, and to establish peace and stability on the continent.

The sides advocate further expansion of participation by African countries in resolving key issues of international life on the bases of justice, equality, and respect for sovereignty.

V. The USSR and Burkina Faso will continue to take all measures aimed at fully implementing the UN declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and people, in order to put an immediate and unconditional end to colonialism, neocolonialism, racism, and apartheid in all forms and manifestations.

The sides are profoundly concerned at the explosive situation which has taken shape in southern Africa, and advocate a just political resolution of it.

This is possible only by means of a complete termination and ban on further acts of aggression by the racist Republic of South African regime against the "frontline" African states; the immediate and unconditional granting of independence to Namibia on the basis of the appropriate UN decisions, including Security Council Resolution 435; and the rapid liquidation of the cruel and inhuman apartheid system in South Africa. They once again declare their unchanging support for the courageous struggle being waged by the South African and Namibian peoples under the leadership of the ANC and SWAPO, and by other peoples in southern Africa, who are subjected daily to aggression by the Pretoria racists.

The Soviet Union and Burkina Faso advocate the urgent introduction of all-embracing and obligatory sanctions against the racist Pretoria regime. The resolutely condemn the policy of "constructive engagement" being pursued by the United States as regards the Republic of South Africa, and the complicity of other Western countries with the apartheid state.

VI. The sides are concerned by the difficult economic situation of developing countries, including those on the African Continent, considering that this is primarily the result of the colonial inheritance, the neocolonialist robbery of liberated states being implemented by imperialist powers and multinational corporations, the continuing arms race, and the unjust modern economic system.

The sides will further with all means at their disposal the normalization of international economic relations, the establishment of a new world economic order, which would guarantee to all states equal economic security, the elimination of underdevelopment, a just settlement of the problem of foreign debt, an immediate end to the neocolonialist exploitation of developing countries, and their economic decolonization.

The USSR and Burkina Faso consider that intergovernment relations must be free of arbitrary behavior and illegal embargoes, boycotts, trade, credit and technological blockades and the use of economic ties as a tool for exerting political pressure. They support the future convocation of an international forum on problems of economic security, where there could be comprehensive discussions of everything that weighs on world economic links.

The two sides note the existence of the direct link between disarmament and development, and support redirecting to peaceful purposes the resources currently spent on armament. They are deeply convinced that to solve problems of economic backwardness in many areas of the world it is essential for there to be a replacement of the flawed principle of armament instead of development by a reversal of the order of things -- disarmament for development.

VII. The USSR and Burkina Faso consider it essential to comprehensively strengthen the role and significance of the United Nations Organization, which is an important instrument for preserving and maintaining peace and solving many acute international problems.

They confirm their total commitment to and support of the objectives and principles of the United Nations, their readiness to cooperate within the framework of this authoritative organization on the basis of strict adherence to its Charter and to make maximum effort to enhance the efficiency of its activities to strengthen peace, security, and international cooperation in all fields.

VIII. The Soviet Union positively appraises the revolutionary process that has been under way in Burkina Faso since 4 August 1983, and expresses its support for the efforts of the Burkinabe people to implement important progressive social and economic transformations under the political leadership of the National Revolutionary Council.

The Soviet Union and Burkina Faso ascribe special significance to the stepping up of political and economic cooperation in the future, and to the creation of a permanent machinery for consultations and exchanges of views between the two countries. With this purpose, the sides have agreed to hold periodic consultations on international issues of mutual interest, and on the issues pertaining to the bilateral relations.

The consultations will have a regular nature and will be held alternatively in Moscow and Ouagadougou. Their level and timing, as well as their agenda will be adopted by mutual consent. Such meetings will in principle be held annually, and whenever the necesstity arises.

The sides are convinced that the visit of the Burkinabe president to the Soviet Union will promote relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Burkina Faso, the expansion of the interaction of the two countries in the cause of strengthening peace and international security in Africa and throughout the world.

For Burkina Faso, T. Sankara

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, A. Gromyko

DOBRYNIN RECEIVES TANZANIA AMBASSADOR

PM201458 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received I. Sepetu, member of the Revolutionary Party (CCM) National Executive Committee and ambassador of the United Republic of Tanzania to the USSR, at his request on 17 October. A friendly talk took place on certain questions of the international situation and Soviet-Tanazanian relations.

DOBRYNIN RECEIVES ETHIOPIAN AMBASSADOR

LD230648 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1648 GMT 22 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Dobrynin today received Asrat Wolde, member of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Ethiopia and Socialist Ethiopia's ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. There was a friendly conversation on questions concerning the further development and strengthening of party links between the CPSU and the WPE, Soviet-Ethiopian relations and certain problems regarding the international situation.

SHIPS ARRIVE ON OFFICIAL VISIT TO CUBA

LD211215 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1132 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] Havana, 21 Oct (TASS) -- A detachment of Soviet military ships consisting of the large antisubmarine ships "Ochakov," "Krasnyy Kavkaz," a diesel submarine, and tanker under the command of Vice Admiral F. T. Starozhilov has arrived on an official, friendly visit to the port of Havana.

The Soviet sailors were welcomed by Rear-Admiral Pedro Peres Betancourt, commander of the revolutionary navy, deputy minister of the Cuban Revolutionary Armed Forces.

In the course of the visit the Soviet guests will be acquainted with the life of the people of Socialist Cuba, visit industrial enterprises and historical places in Havana, and meet sailors in the armed forces and working people of the republic.

BRUTENTS ENDS VISIT TO PANAMA 5 OCTOBER

PM0717427 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Visit Concluded"]

[Text] Panama City, 5 Oct -- A CPSU delegation headed by K. N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, has ended its visit to Panama.

During its stay in the country the delegation had meetings and conversations with members of the People's Party of Panama [PPP] leadership headed by Ruben Dario Sousa, general secretary of the PPP Central Committee, and visited a number of party organizations.

The exchange of opinions confirmed the unity of views on fundamental problems of the contemporary international situation and world development. The Panamanian comrades declared complete support for the Soviet peace initiatives based on new political thinking and corresponding with the realities of the nuclear and space age. Both sides spoke in favor of the further development of friendly ties between the CPSU and the PPP.

Meetings were also held with the leadership of Panama's ruling Democratic Revolutionary Party.

The delegation departed for home today. It was seen off at the intenational airport by Ruben Dario Sousa and other members of the PPP leadership.

MOSCOW WORKER EXECUTED FOR ESPIONAGE FOR U.S.

LD221253 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 22 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS -- As has already been reported, the State Security Committee of the USSR had exposed Adolf Tolkachev, a staff worker of a Moscow Research Institute, as an agent of U.S. intelligence and started criminal proceedings against him.

It was established in the course of the investigation that Tolkachev, in pursuit of selfish ends and on account of his hostile attitude to the Soviet State, had maintained espionage contacts with U.S. intelligence agents who had been in Moscow under the guise of U.S. Embassy personnel.

The military collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR, which examined the criminal case filed against Tolkachev, found him guilty of high treason in the form of spying and, considering the gravity of his crime, sentenced him to the exceptional measure of punishment -- death.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR turned down Tolkachev's appeal for clemency.

The sentence has been carried out.

YELTSIN ADDRESS TO MOSCOW CPSU GORKOM PLENUM

PM211031 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 p 2

[Unattributed report of speech by B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, at 4 October Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum, under the general heading "Making the Restructuring Irreversible"]

[Text] Of course, today's theme has aroused great interest, and this is very understandable because it is very topical for Moscow, Muscovites, and the Moscow of the future from the viewpoint of the city's development and the resolution of social problems and as regards the renewal of enterprises ad organizations and the activation of the contribution made by science. There are many questions here. Of course, we cannot fail to be pleased at such active participation today in the discussion of this question at the plenum.

Comrades, out of the many problems of Moscow's socioeconomic development, we of course highlight this pivotal question -- the shift onto an intensive path of development -- because in all the preceding 5-year periods Moscow developed on the extensive path, that is, by increasing the numbers of workers. Now we are setting the task of fulfilling the 12th 5-Year Plan targets with a smaller number of workers, and this is how the task must be understood: by the team, the sector, the shop, the enterprise, the laboratory, the section, the institute, the rayon, and the city as a whole.

The whole analysis of the city's development in the preceding years confirms that the miscalculation made in determining Moscow's population is, perhaps, the main cause of many of our ills. Today the population is already almost 1 million more than planned in the General Plan for 1990! We will obviously add to this in 5 years. Here lie the sources of the capital's economic, social, moral, and many other problems.

It is obvious today that comrades nevertheless support the line taken by the party gorkom in this regard aimed at reducing mechanical growth and minimizing or halting the importation of nonlocal workers from all over the country, which is running at 300,000, 350,000, or 400,000 in a 5-year period. We aim to halt it completely from 1987.

Supported by the opinion of the broad aktiv, scientists, specialsts, and labor collectives, the party gorkom and the gorispolkom have elaborated main directions for the city's future development. They are laid out in the Concept for Moscow's Comprehensive Socioeconomic Development for the Period Through 2000, very vigorously debated and then approved at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on 25 September. The Concept embraces a wide range of questions. Let us look briefly at some of them.

First, considering that Moscow's development in the next 15 years will proceed in complex demographic conditions, the number of inhabitants of working age will constantly decrease. Despite this we believe it necessary, as I said, to minimize mechanical growth and above all to halt the importation of workers.

The Politburo actively supported us in this plan, particularly because it believes that the policy of reducing the growth of the city's population is the only right one if we are to escape from the impasse at all. Because it is not even known in which direction Moscow could develop further, we are surrounded by a green belt. We must not retreat one step from that principle at any enterprise, in any rayon, or in the city as a whole.

So how will we manage? We have the concept, today's report, and the speeches answering these questions in principle. It is planned to cut the number of workers in urban development sectors and redistribute labor resources into sectors which ensure the city's vital activity. The rate of labor productivity growth will be around 2.5 points even in the current 5-year plan, but we must strive harder and overtake the rate of production volume growth.

One of the ways to do this is to involve pensioners, women, students, and schoolchildren more broadly in social production and reduce all kinds of labor wastage. The sphere of essential service provision will expand at a great rate. Moreover -- and we must not forget this -- it will only be expanded intensively. At the moment this sphere is ready for only thing -- to absorb more and more new manpower. It is an area, indeed, in which people are not even thinking about cutting manpower.

Leaders of service sphere enterprise party organizations do not trouble themselves with improving productivity or introducing substantiated norm setting and scientific labor organization. We are not satisfied with the work of this sector today because, after all, we have to expand services, make the network more ramified, improve standards, and so forth. Long-term measures to expand the services sphere, centralize public catering procurement facilities, and bring mechanization into the trade sphere have not even been worked out yet; this is probably the only area which is not even in the development phase, even though the deadlines for the task are past. [paragraph continues]

I would remind you that those responsible for this are Gorkom Secretary Comrade Nizovtsev for the party gorkom, and Comrades Matveyev and Zharov for the gorispolkom.

The concept envisages that, while developing under conditions of limited labor resources, Moscow will not reduce its proportional contribution to the country's national economy.

Capital investments will mainly be targeted toward remodeling and retooling existing enterprises. The task has been set of radically renewing the active part of fixed production capital and in the current 5-year plan of reducing the use of manual labor by at least 20 percent.

As for the resolution of social problems, housing and transport, health care, culture, trade, public education, public catering, and consumer services, the aim is full provision of children's establishments by 1990, an individual apartment for every family by 2000, and the attainment of normatives in other areas also by 2000.

This will not, of course, be easy to achieve, but the task is fundamental for the whole city party organization. We must raise the entire construction complex to a new technical and organizational level.

In this 5-year plan it is already planned to increase construction organizations' capacities by 25 percent, and a proposal has been approved for more active involvement by construction organizations, ministries, and departments in the city's problems. People must bear this in mind -- and that includes the ministry party committee secretaries present here. We will gradually reduce the volume of construction being done by Moscow main administrations outside the city boundaries, which amounts to over R1 billion's worth of construction and installation work per year throughout the 5-year plan. On the other hand the question has been raised -- and the idea has not been rejected -- of construction and assistance for Moscow, of union republics' using their resources to construct a number of installations in the country's capital.

It is planned to carry out urban development, while at the same time checking territorial growth as far as possible and not encroaching on the parkland belt. The ratio between the city nucleus, the urban territory and the protective parkland belt is 1 to 7. In Leningrad the ratio is 1 to 4.8, in Kiev 1 to 5, and so on. So we must not allow this protective forest and parkland belt to be absorbed in the city, otherwise we will simply have nowhere to breathe.

We are taking measures to halt the construction of new installations for production purposes and mothball certain construction projects that have been started and to remove enterprises, organizations, VUZ's, and scientific institutes that do not fit into the city. This has been emphasized, notably at the Politburo.

The future of downtown Moscow remains a fundamental question. Inside the Sadovoye Koltso [Garden Ring] it has been decided to accelerate the revamping of old buildings taking account of the historically shaped traditional architecture and not to build new facilities in this zone. It is planned to remove around 200 offices from first stories and devote these premises to trade and public catering. We must treat the preservation of historical, architectural, and artistic monuments with abundant care, double the volume of restoration, and prepare a special draft USSR Council of Ministers resolution for the city center.

The task has been set of doubling subway construction, and a government resolution has already been adopted on passenger transport. The Concept is shaped by one of the fundamental questions of the city's future development -- the deepening of links with Moscow Oblast. A number of sectors will develop by locating their branches in cities in the oblast, new installations common to the Moscow region will be created in energy, industry, construction materials, and municipal services, and a program for developing intersectoral production is being drafted. In these conditions closer interaction and coordination of development between the economies of Moscow and the oblast is growing up.

There is now a need -- and perhaps we shall be considering it -- to create a special organ, if only a coordinating organ to begin with, at the level of the Moscow City Planning Commission and the Moscow Oblast Planning Commission. A joint, interested approach to the problems of the entire Moscow region will make it possible to resolve many questions more efficiently and to resolve the questions of the populations's employment and the reduction of commuting and migration. At present 600,000 people travel from the oblast to work in Moscow and 200,000 from Moscow travel to work in the oblast.

These are just a few provisions of the Concept. Having been approved by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, the Concept for Comprehensive Socioeconomic Development is today the fundamental document in the elaboration of all our plans. We must not put up with the errors of the previous two General Plans for Moscow of 1935 and 1971, which were elaborated and approved without having a plan for the city's socioeconomic development.

This time the following procedure is being observed: There is the approved Concept, and a 15-year plan is being drawn up based on it; technical and economic feasibility studies will be carried out and a General Plan elaborated in parallel -- first a long-term socioeconomic development plan, then the General Plan for Moscow through 2010 will be approved.

The task of party gorkom members, the entire party aktiv, propaganda workers, and the mass media is to conduct this work at all stages publicly, constantly consulting with Muscovites.

Comrades, the discussion today of topical problems concerning Moscow's future development requires us to talk again and again about the process of restructuring our work, without which we cannot resolve the major tasks of renewal either in society as a whole or in our city. It requires us to talk about its progress in people's hearts and minds and in actions and to provide an objective answer to the question which concerns not only us Muscovites but everyone, at whatever stage of restructuring we may be and however profound and rapid the process. We must do this taking account of the criticism voiced by M.S. Gorbachev in the Far East, Krasnodar, and Stavropol Kray.

The whole world is watching to see if the Soviets' restructuring will happen or not. This is now a question of very, very big politics, of course, and the West is naturally hoping that we will not succeed.

Now it has been clearly defined: As the party committee acts, so the pace of restructuring is set. It started in the party, and now the standpoint of society's renewal is supported as a whole by people. We can see how they are being motivated, boldly expressing opinions, pointedly raising questions, knocking at all doors, striving to take part in the renewal process, and seeking to reach its essence.

The time has come for the city party organization to really get involved in restructuring, embracing all spheres and categories and introducing it more boldly. But we still fear to apply greater democracy in all areas of our work, including cadre selection.

Working in a new way means improving the style of work. We are still proving unable to do without generating unnecessary paper work.

It is time for us to beset all ministries and departments with tough monitoring and accountability procedures to reduce the flow of paper. Because the apparatus itself is delaying restructuring with its own bureaucratism. Even party committees have not rid themselves of superfluous conferences and orders, and this suppresses initiative. The party gorkom itself is unfortunately not blameless either. The last plenum referred quite critically to some of the first results of restructuring. Reactions and results vary, unfortunately. The impression could be formed that criticism does not work, does not cure. Indeed, over the years some comrades have formed, so to speak, a specific immunity to the good example. Some of them are congenitally incapable of grasping criticism.

But we need not fear this process either: These neglected illnesses must be cured, and we must learn to cure them together. Especially as there are people who are recovering. These are those who have drawn the correct conclusions for themselves, shifted from talk to action, started to look at all processes in a new way, and -- the main point -- to act vigorously.

Igor Mikhaylovich Golovkov, first secretary of Kuntsevskiy Raykom, for instance, drew useful lessons from personal criticism. He overcame himself, I would say. He restructured the apparatus, the style started to change, an acceleration is apparent in economic activity and other spheres, and discipline has been tightened. Since the start of the year losses of work time have been reduced by one-fourth and public order is strengthening, and I believe that Igor Mikhaylovich has enough courage to withstand not only the past criticism but also the kind words spoken today.

Comrade Martin, first secretary of Moskvoretskiy Raykom, also listened to advice. He clarified the congress directives in an informal way, relied on the healthy forces within the raykom, the working aktiv, resolutely but justifiably renewed apparatus cadres, and actively carried out certification; and the bureaucrats and idlers, those incapable of grasping people's needs, were requested to leave the ispolkom. Inefficient economic leaders were called to order. A plenum on social questions and the activation of the human factor was recently held in businesslike fashion, strictly and constructively. It is still a little early to go to Moskvoretskiy party raykom for experience, but there are improvements. Only it is necessary not to stand still, but to implement what has been planned more rapidly.

The recent plenum of Sverdlovskiy party raykom, (first secretary Comrade Kislova), which heard a report by the Ministry of Health party committee, was interesting. Eleven ministers and eleven party committee secretaries of ministries located on the rayon's territory were invited to this plenum. There was a very exacting and businesslike discussion of the party committee's work, and we need our party aktiv to have an active influence on the apparatus work, including the apparatus at rayon level, because there are 92 ministries in Moscow. Clearly, the party gorkom cannot cover these numbers of itself.

Rayon committees must be bolder in tackling the work of ministry party committees. A change in approach, a search for new forms and methods, and a break with cliches and empty words are emerging most fully in the work of Baumanskiy, Volgogradskiy, and Lyublinskiy Raykoms (First Secretaries Comrades Nikolayev, Belyaninov, and Nemtinov). The comrades have drawn the correct conclusions from criticism, a creative acceleration has developed, and I believe that after a good word they will redouble their efforts.

However, some raykom secretaries remain deaf to the demands of the time. The old, lulling principle is at work: Things are not so bad with us. No, they are bad! They are bad because this attitude betrays complacency and a lack of understanding of what is happening in the party and the country. The party gorkom is attentively and carefully analyzing the activity of the raykoms and of each first secretary. We are using various forms and talking to conferences of bureau members. We are calling on first secretaries to meet with raykom apparatuses, making a profound study on all study courses of the state of affairs in the rayon economy and social sphere, the raykom's work style, and the influence exerted on primary organizations, and assess the role of the party raykom first secretaries in all this.

The raykom bureaus and the gorkom secretaries have already formed a firm opinion of the work of all the party raykom first secretaries. Conversations have taken place with many of them in which everything -- both good and bad -- in their own and the raykom's work was openly and frankly discussed, and some were told bluntly of the doubts as to the expediency of their further work if there were not rapid changes (we must not forget that 8 months have already elapsed.)

Most of them understood, but not all. Comrades Komarov, first secretary of Kirovskiy Raykom, has repeatedly been criticized at gorkom plenums. We know that it is not an easy rayon. So the raykom should act accordingly. But this is not happening. At a conversation at the gorkom he was told literally, word for word: You are not showing enough initiative and creativity; you have been unable to highlight the most important elements in the rayon party organization's work; people are having to be prompted to work; the question of developing the economy is being resolved with insufficient depth and competence; and there is a tendency to shift responsibility onto other people. He was given time to weigh everything up and take a decision himself in the name of the rayon party organization. After due consideration he came to the conclusion that he could not substantially change and raise the level of leadership. So he requested a transfer to other work. Well, we believe that he acted in a principled and party manner.

Comrade Potopanov is first secretary of Tushinskiy Raykom. In an interview at the gorkom he found it hard to accept the criticism leveled against him, but afterward he requested a month to think about whether or not he was capable of leading the rayon party organization under the new conditions. Two months have passed. He remains silent, and little has changed in the rayon: It is time for him to decide what is to happen.

Party raykoms must give individual appraisals of work in the postcongress period to every leader and every shop, section, enterprise, institute, and social orgnaization chief and then -- most importantly -- they must draw conclusions. We cannot and we will not permit time to work in favor of those who want to push us again into the mire of lethargy disguised by an outer gloss.

Many of our leaders have been checked on a very acute and urgent question for Muscovites -- the fruit and vegetable trade. The attitudes of some comrades show a typical pattern in tuning up for restructuring. Many Muscovites are content, but we cannot be content. The holiday [presumably Constitution day] came to Moscow, not, indeed, without your participation but mainly thanks to the great efforts of the central organs, the union republics, and the RSFSR oblasts. Some people in our city are now smugly puffing their cheeks and proudly straightening their shoulders. But after all, the Moscow trade looked extremely modest against the backdrop created by the visitors. What lesson can be drawn from last Sunday at the Preobrazhenskiy Market, when next to the bright Kuban encampment our trade and public catering stalls looked simply wretched? Primitive and vulgar -- these are descriptions you could use. Does this standard of trade in the capital really suit Kuybyshevskiy Raykom and Rayispolkom, and Comrades Komzolov and Gavrilov?

The same applies to some other rayons too. The fact is that some comrades found their heads starting to swim very early. Attention must not be focused on successes, and more forces must be concentrated on shortcomings, of which there are still very many. There is no need to be afraid to talk about this openly. In some places exclamations are already beginning to be heard: Is there not a bit too much criticism? No. We will maintain it. There will always be positive things in our aktiv, and Muscovites value this. But shortcomings must be ruthlessly exposed and eliminated; we need not necessaryil try to equalize the balance between pluses and minuses, even in information reports; and criticism in the press must be reacted to with action and not arrogance -- as unfortunately does happen.

Frankly, Comrades, it must be said that party gorkom bureau members are amazed at the attitude to rayon paroblems of many rayispolkom chairmen. Is it not time to shake up some of them, especially the time-servers? Some actually avoid adopting special, serious, or major decisions in order to aboid the trouble of fulfilling them later. This has been elevated to the rank of policy -- not to take decisions and not to fulfill them accordingly.

But what do we expect of Comrade Ilin, chairman of Sokoinicheskiy Rayispolkom? For 12 years he has created more problems than he has solved. So we will have to wait another 10 years before he begins to restructure? Raykom first Secretary Comrade Maksimova is also waiting for something, so such work by the rayispolkom obviously suits her. But, after all, Comrade Ilin has two party penalties to his name. Does such a communist have the moral right to lead the ispolkom? It is now time for Moscow Gorispolkom to be more principled in its appraisals and bolder and more resolute in its conclusions, and not to wait for decisions from the party gorkom.

Problems in Lyublinskiy Rayon have reached an extreme point. The young leaders of the party raykom have been forced to breach the deep defenses of the rayispolkom with a battering ram. But is it necessary to build up relations like this? What are we waiting for? Rayispolkom Chairman Comrade Stolyarov has completely stopped working. He has barricaded himself in with a dozen carbon copies of resolutions and hopes to sit it out quietly, in vain. Indifference, ambition, arrogance, and lordly manners -- these are words from Lyublinskiy Rayon's people's lexicon of criticisms directed at their chairman. They were not thought up at the gorkom.

Some people may have gotten the impression that we are calling for reprisals against cadres. No. We are calling not for reprisals, but for an exacting appraisal of each one's action. If you are capable, work and prove it by action. If you are not, make way. Do not hold back movement. Let more energetic and enterprising people, capable of setting things in motion, take your place. This will be in the party spirit.

Remember Lenin, who talked about cadres who blinded themselves. It is better for such an organizer to retire and clear a space for young forces whose energy will compensate with interests for the commonplace and the studied routine. It will be more economical for the state and the party to deal with them now than to bear their passivity for many years.

Comrades, the restructuring of the economy and the restructuring of social relations are inextricably connected. We have already spoken of the increasing role of the human factor. However, many party committees are proclaiming this fundamental conclusion and then immediately forgetting all about it. Very often party workers show themselves to be ordinary technocrats, and not respresentatives of an organ of political leadership, seeing not people in production but a soulless technological process, not a person but an accumulation of repair, amenity provision, and other economic problems, and they hope to bring about order in this way.

Until we rouse people and stir them up, we will not liberate the energy fettered by red tape, narrow-mindedness, distrust, and the pernicious forces of habituation to parasitism, and until that time we will have to be satisfied with small improvements.

These errors were clearly revealed during a discussion at the party gorkom bureau of the work practice of Proletarskiy Rayon party organizations in activating the human factor under the conditions of the acceleration. First Secretary Comrade Korchagin still operates by outdated and outmoded methods and lacks sufficient system in his work and the ability concentrate attention on key problems. This affects the apparatus personnel, and as a result the raykom's work lacks effectiveness.

To conclude, what are the urgent tasks for carrying through restructuring in the city?

First, accelerating its interpretation. The concept of acceleration must be mastered like a multiplication table -- a multiplication of forces and energy -- and the social consequences of adopted decisions and actions must be constantly checked against the opinion of labor collectives, momentary advantages must not be sought, and political appraisals from the central committee must be studied.

Second, more decisive actions are needed. It is better to take risks than to remain idle. We re not traveling the same road as temporizers. We must act systematically, proceed on a broad front, concentrating on the most important things, attract people, and reach out to every labor collective and every primary party organization.

Third, concerning work with cadres. We must go beyond the narrow circle of the approved list [nomenklatura], put an end to its self-perpetuation, and have done with deferring to the self-esteem of the managerial collegium at the state's expense. We must not ask officials how they are working, but ask the people whom they serve whether they are capable in their work.

We do have, of course, enough fresh forces, talented organizers, and genuine fighters in Moscow, but we do not know how to find them or how to cultivate them. We talk about reserves over and over again. The reserves must be trained, Comrade Skitev and gorkom sections chiefs, both purposefully and openly [glasno]. Cadre questions must be resolved so that the replacement of a worker does not preserve the status quo, but signifies a new, creative approach and rapid movement forward.

Fourth, an increase in exactingness. The higher the post, the greater the responsibility. Leaders must be described without compliments. It must be simply determined what a leader has done personally and how he has personally improved himself. There must be high exactingness toward everyone both leaders and workers, from above and from below -- and from the other side there must be responsibility. It is time to seek real individual responsibility from every person, as has been stated today.

Fifth, restructuring is a common concern, and it means openness and information. Only these characteristics can ensure conscious discipline and harmonious action and describe failures and problems honestly. Muscovites will be quick to understand and support this.

Sixth, the ideological work we are conducting today is not producing a revolution in thinking. We are still going to face ostentation, dogmatism, and stock phrases.

Behind the deadly boredom and banality of many lectures, discussions, and articles is the inability of a large section of the ideological aktiv to rouse other people by their very enthusiasm for transformations. They must open their own and everybody else's eyes wider to simply everything. Comrades, we members of the party gorkom are above all responsible for the dynamism of the process and for its radical acceleration in the period of society's renewal in Moscow. Anyone who remembers his membership of this body only when he comes to plenums lags behind a little more every day. We propose reporting to you at the next plenum on the work of party gorkom members and candidate members in the period that has elapsed since the conference. Every Communist is required to devote all his energies to the transformation now in progress.

It is thus and only thus that we must put the question of our attitude to our task. Only such an approach can ensure the successful resolution of the questions of today's plenum too.

For this reason I would like to end my speech with an appeal to every person sitting in the hall -- to reduce the gap between talk and action daily, hourly, sparing no efforts, thereby justifying the confidence of the city's communists and of all Muscovites.

Further Report

PM091419 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Making Restructuring Irreversible. Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum"]

[Excerpt] A Moscow party Gorkom plenum was held yesterday. The plenum discussed the Moscow city party organization's tasks in restructuring the city's economy onto an intensive path of development and fulfilling the 12th 5-Year Plan targets with fewer workers. A report was delivered by Moscow Gorkom Secretary O.A. Korolev.

V.A. Zheltov, first secretary of the Krasnogvardeyskiy CPSU Raykom; A.N. Napolnov, general director of Moscow's Chernyshev Machine Building Production Association; A.N. Shubin, secretary of the Institute of Management Problems party bureau; L.I. Antipova, Kalibr plant assembly worker and shop party organization secretary; L.N. Shepilova, secretary of the Parizhskaya Kommuna footwear factory party committee; I.I. Gladkiy, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Questions; A.M. Beschastnov, driver at the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Motor Vehicle Transport Administration's No. 3 Motor Vehicle Combine and combine party committee member; A.S. Matrosov, chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Water Pipe and Sewerage Facilities Administration; S.P. Skoromyslov, director of the No. 40 Vocational and Technical College; Z.N. Zharenkova, team leader at the Moscow Krasnaya Zarya Knitwear Production Association; F.F. Svetik, first secretary of the Oktyabrskiy CPSU Raykom; R.A. Tabunova, assembly worker at the First Moscow Clock and Watch Plant; V.G. Kulak, casting worker at the 60-Letiye Oktyabrya Truck and Tractor Electrical Apparatus Plant; I.A. Stroyev, secretary of the Znamya Truda plant party committee; and A.V. Ignatyev, secretary of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building party committee; spoke in the debate.

B.N. Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, spoke at the plenum.

The plenum unanimously adopted a resolution on the question under discussion.

The plenum released V.G. Zakharov from his duties as second secretary and member of the Bureau of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom in connection with his appointment as USSR minister of culture.

The plenum elected O.A. Belyakov, former first deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, as secretary and member of the Bureau of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

L.V. Petrov was released from his duties as gorkom bureau member in connection with his retirement on pension. Moscow City Trade Union Council Chairman V.P. Shcherbakov was elected a bureau member.

In connection with his election as first deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom and approval as chairman of the Moscow City Agro-Industrial Committee F.F. Kozyrev-dal was released from his duties as member of the CPSU gorkom bureau. Sverdlovskiy CPSU Raykom First Secretary N.Ye. Kislova was elected a bureau member.

The plenum approved the following as Moscow CPSU Gorkom section chiefs -- B.M. Mikhaylov at the Science and Educational Establishments Section, V.S. Shchegolev at the Foreign Relations Section, and A.N. Tsaregorodtsev at the General Section.

N.A. Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Section, participated in the plenum's work. [passage omitted summarizing Korolev report, debate speeches]

'Inaccuracies' Corrected

PM211317 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 86 p 2

["Correction" -- MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In the 5 October edition of our newspaper the material published on the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum contained a number of serious misprints and inaccuracies.

In the Information Report on page 1 (third column, first paragraph) the initials of Yu.A. Belyakov, second secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, were incorrect [page R 10, fourth paragraph, line four should now read "Yu.A." sted "O.A." Belyakov].

On page 2 (speech by B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom) in the first paragraph of the third column [page R 3 paragraph seven, line five] the figures expressing the ratio between Moscow's territory and the territory of the protective woodland and park zone were given incorrectly as ("1:7" instead of "1:1.7").

On the same page, fifth column, line one of the second paragraph from the bottom "of the raykom" is superfluous (page R 6, second paragraph, last line should now read: ...in all this. The gorkom bureau and secretaries have already... (picking up third paragraph, line one). In the fourth paragraph of the sixth column [page R 7, first paragraph, line six] the word "your" should read "our." In the eighth column, third paragraph the world "of the collegium" has been printed instead of "of the colleague" [page R 8, penultimate paragraph, line four should now read: ...self-esteem of managerial colleagues at the state's expense.] And in the same column, fourth paragraph from the bottom "still persist" should read "are still having a deleterious effect" [page R 9, paragraph three, lines two and three should now read: ...revolution in thinking. Ostentation, dogmatism, and stock phrases are still having a deleterious effect. Behind the deadly... (picking up fourth paragraph, line one)].

All this distorts the meaning of the text. In a number of sentences the punctuation is wrong. There are also other inaccuracies and careless mistakes.

The editorial office presents its profound apologies to the readers. Members of the editorial staff -- Deputy Editor Yu.A. Kurbatov; Senior Secretary S.F. Matonin; and correspondents O.V. Lysenskiy and A.S. Antonov, who were responsible for the mistakes, have been severely punished.

SUPREME SOVIET PRESIDIUM TO CONVENE 17 NOV

LD180157 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Oct 86

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has decreed that the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, be convened 17 November in Moscow.

It is proposed to submit for the deputies' discussion the questions of the state plan for the economic and social development of the country for 1987 and the course of the fulfillment of the plan for this year; of the state budget of the USSR for 1987 and the fulfillment of the state budget for 1985; of the activity of the country's People's Control Committee; of the USSR draft law on individual labor activity, and of confirming the decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

TEXT OF CSA REPORT ON 9-MONTH PLAN FULFILLMENT

PM211034 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 86 First Edition pp 1-3

[USSR Central Statistical Administration report: "End the Year With Accelerated Rates. On the Results of the Fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in the First 9 Months of 1986" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] The results for January-September 1986 testify that the process of restructuring in the country in accordance with the 27th CPSU Congress decisions is gaining momentum with increasing confidence, positive changes are taking place in the economy, and the indicators for the development of many sectors of the national economy exceed the corresponding rates for last year and the plan targets for the current year.

The country's economic and social development is characterized by the following figures.

	First 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of First 9 Months of 1985
Produced national income	104.3
Industrial output	105.2
Commissioning of fixed capital from state capital investments	112
State capital investments	109
Freight shipments (consignments) by all types of transportation	105.6
Passenger turnover on all types of transportation	103.9
Labor productivity:	
in industry	104.8
in construction	104.5
in railroad transportation	108.2
Number of workers and employees	100.7
Average money wage of workers and employees	102.9
Remuneration of kolkhoz members in public-sector farming	104
Payments and benefits to the population from social consumption funds	104
Retail trade turnover in state and cooperative trade	106.6
Volume of sales of consumer services to the population	117
Total area of housing commissioned out of state capital investment	111
Foreign trade turnover	91

The targets for most general economic indicators are being fulfilled.

PRODUCED NATIONAL INCOME increased by R18 billion or 4.3 percent in comparison with the first 9 months of 1985.

During this period INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT increased by R31 billion. Fulfillment of the plan for the production of the most important types of output and contractual commitments improved in comparison with the corresponding period of last year.

The commissioning of FIXED CAPITAL from state capital investments increased by R8.5 billion.

Large-scale measures were elaborated and are being implemented to accelerate scientific and technical progress, improve output quality, save resources, and improve management and the economic machinery in industry and the agro-industrial and construction complexes, trade, transportation, and material and technical supply.

Work on saving material resources was intensified in all components of the national economy. The prescribed targets for reducing expenditure norms for fuel and energy resources, rolled nonferrous metals, and pipes were fulfilled. Around 15 million metric tons of ideal fuel, over 24,000 metric tons of rolled nonferrous metals, and more than 50,000 metric tons of pipes were saved. The involvement of secondary raw materials in the national economy increased. At the same time individual ministries and departments failed to cope with their targets for saving material resources and utilizing secondary raw materials.

Preparations for the winter are nearing completion.

Reserves of fuel for provision to the national economy grew.

LABOR DISCIPLINE increased. There was a considerable reduction in losses of work time. A reduction in unjustified diversions of working people from their main activity was observed. However, the magnitude of these is still considerable.

Progressive forms of labor organization and incentive aimed at improving the end results of economic activity spread. Job certification was carried out.

AT THE SAME TIME THE TRANSITION OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY TO THE TRACKS OF INTENSIFICATION IS PROGRESSING SLOWLY, AND A LARGE NUMBER OF LABOR COLLECTIVES HAVE STILL NOT JOINED IN RESTRUCTURING. Despite fulfilling the 9-month plan, as a whole industry failed to cope with the September target. The end of the quarter saw a serious lag in the fulfillment of the product mix plan and the plan for deliveries of output in line with contracts. Work to raise the technical standard, quality, and reliability of products is not being conducted on the requisite scale. Production growth rates were below the annual plan targets in the USSR Ministries of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the Electrical Equipment Industry, Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Feed Production, the Petroleum Industry, and Light Industry and the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee.

A tense situation was created with respect to the commissioning of many production capacities. The 9-month plan for the construction of housing and sociocultural projects was not fulfilled.

FOREIGN TRADE TURNOVER totaled R95 billion.

Foreign trade with the socialist states is developing successfully. Direct production ties with fraternal countries' enterprises are strengthening. The volume of output supplied under agreements on specialization and production sharing between the USSR and CEMA countries is increasing.

I. Scientific and Technical Progress [subhead] In the national economy a start was made on implementing the scientific and technical programs mapped out by the 5-year plan aimed at developing and assimilating new generations of equipment, progressive technologies, and construction materials with intersector applications.

Over R24 billion in state capital investments or 25 percent more than in the first 9 months of last year were utilized for modernizing and retooling existing enterprises.

An assessment of the technical standard of output and its correspondence to the best world models is being carried out.

In INDUSTRY around 8,000 industrial robots were introduced and more than 6,000 mechanized flow, automatic, rotary, and rotary-conveyor production lines were installed. Some 4,000 sections, shops, and production processes were transferred to comprehensive mechanization and automation. The production of more than 2,000 new types of output was assimilated and begun.

In sectors of the FUEL AND ENERGY COMPLEX the scale of the application of resource-saving technologies broadened.

There was an increase in the extraction of coal using the open-cut method and of oil using new methods for treating oil-bearing strata. However losses of casinghead gas and also of petroleum because of insufficiently intensive refining are still substantial.

In enterprises in the METALLURGICAL COMPLEX production of thin-sheet transformer steel and corrosion-resistant reinforcing steel was assimilated; there was an increase in the production of rolled metal made from nonfurnace vacuum-cast steel [stal vnepechnogo vakuumirovaniya], heat-treated steel, and low-alloy steel.

Around 1.5 million metric tons of metal was saved in the national economy as a result of the increase in production of economic types of metal output.

At the same time the targets for the continuous casting of steel and the production of iron powders and high-strength drilling pipes were not fulfilled.

In the MACHINE BUILDING COMPLEX the utilization of progressive technological processes used in producing dies expanded and highly efficient equipment for the plasma treatment of materials was introduced.

Production of new computer means, equipment to produce electricity from solar energy, and wide-sweep mineral fertilizer and lime applicators was stated up.

Production of metal-cutting machine tools with digital program control, processing centers, rotary and rotary-conveyor production lines, flexible production modules, more easily installable drilling, and the new generation of economical pumps increased at preferential rates.

At the same time the planned volume of production of individual types of new highly efficient output was not secured. The Ministries of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the Automotive Industry, Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, and Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Feed Production did not fulfill the plan for the production of machines for the continuous casting of billets, trucks powered by liquefied and compressed gas, and individual types of agricultural equipment.

Enterprises in the CHEMICAL AND TIMBER COMPLEX assimilated materials and products utilized in various sectors of the national economy. They include high-strength polyamide monofilament for the tire and fishing industry and membranes utilized to filter medical preparations, vaccines, and serums and obtain particularly pure solvents.

The proportion of synthetic fibers and filaments in the total volume of production of chemical fibers and filaments increased to 58 percent.

There was an increase in the production of individual types of less pulp-intensive paper, which made it possible to save 0.8 million cubic meters of timber raw material.

More than 500 brands of industrial output were stripped of the State Seal of Quality. They include automatic production lines with flexible transportation links from the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry's Krasnodar Machine Tool Building Association, a self-propelled rotary-action percussion drilling installation used in mining from the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building's Kuznetsk Machine Building Plant, a drilling and loading machine from the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry's Kopeysk Machine Building Plant named for Kirov, and the RAF-2203 bus from the Ministry of the Automotive Industry's Riga Minibus Plant.

Production of CONSUMER GOODS is increasing, but the quality of many of them still fails to meet consumers' increased demands. There are particularly many complaints about complex domestic equipment.

In the AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX on 29 September winter crops for harvesting in 1987 had been sown on the basis of intensive techniques on an area of 13.2 million hectares or 79 percent of the target.

In stockraising the comprehensive mechanization of production processes was carried out, flowline methods of livestock tending were utilized, and work was carried out to increase the pedigree and productive qualities of dairy breeds of livestock.

The food industry saw the introduction of technologies ensuring the comprehensive low-waste processing of agricultural raw materials.

At the same time the absence on farms of the necessary system of machines to cultivate many agricultural crops and also of progressive equipment in the food industry precludes a sharp reduction in losses of output.

The use of heavyweight and long trains was further developed in railroad TRANSPORTATION. The average gross mass of trains increased.

In general purpose motor transportation the freight turnover carried by trucks fueled by liquefied and compressed gas doubled, however, the proportion of these shipments within the total motor transportation remained negligible.

Measures to increase the level of industrialization were implemented in THE CONSTRUCTION COMPLEX. The construction machine pool was swelled by new machinery ensuring the comprehensive mechanization of construction and installation work. However, this machinery is being unsatisfactorily utilized. There has been no substantial increase in output of the main types of machines, and they spend 1.5-2 times the normative period undergoing repairs.

In the construction materials industry production of cement by energy-saving processes is growing only slowly. It accounts for less than 17 percent of the total volume of cement production.

The plan for the development of science and technology and the scientific and technical program targets have not been fulfilled.

The greatest lags have been allowed to occur by the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Domestic Appliances, the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry, the Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry, and the USSR State Agro-industrial Committee.

II. Industry [subhead]

THE TOTAL VOLUME OF INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT increased by 5.2 percent compared with the corresponding period last year as against the annual plan of 4.3 percent.

Machine building is developing at preferential rates. The coal industry and ferrous metallurgy are working stably. The lag in the oil extraction industry is being overcome. The production of cultural, everyday, and household goods is being stepped up.

The fulfillment of contractual commitments regarding deliveries improved compared with the corresponding period of last year in most ministries, especially those working under the new economic management conditions.

All union republics and industrial ministries except the Ministry of the Radio Industry fulfilled the output sales plan.

The plan for REDUCING THE PRIME COST of industrial output and INCREASING PROFITS was fulfilled.

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY increased 4.8 percent and accounted for 94 percent of the increase in production. Labor productivity growth outstripped the increase in average wages.

Work to organize the transfer of enterprises to two- and three-shift working was begun in a number of oblasts in the country.

The growth rates of production and labor productivity and the fulfillment of the industrial output sales plan for [industrial] COMPLEXES AND MINISTRIES are as follows:

Complexes, All-union and Union Republican Ministries and Departments	First 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of First 9 Months of 1985		Percentage Fulfillment of 9-Month Plan Output Sales Plan
	Production Volume	Labor Produtivity	
Fuel and Energy Complex	104	103	102
Power and Electrification	103	102	101
Petroleum Industry	103	98	100.1
Gas Industry	109	107	103
Coal Industry	104	104	103
Metallurgical Complex	105	105	102
Ferrous Metallurgy	105	105	102
Nonferrous Metallurgy	103	104	101
Machine-building Complex	107	107	102
Power Machine Building	107	107	102
Heavy and Transport Machine Building	105	106	101
Electrical Equipment Industry	107	109	100.9

Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building	106	106	102
Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry	108	108	101
Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems	109	108	103
Automotive Industry	106	106	103
Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building	107	107	102
Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production	106	106	102
Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building	107	107	103
Machine Building for the Light and Food Industry and Domestic Appliances	107	108	100.4
Chemical and Timber Complex	106	106	101
Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry	103	104	100.8
Chemical Industry	108	108	100.9
Mineral Fertilizer Production	109	108	101
Medical and Microbiological Industry	110	109	100.9
Timber, Pulp and Paper and Wood Processing Industry	107	107	102
Agro-Industrial Complex	104	105	103
State Agro-Industrial Committee	105	105	103
Fish Industry	105	106	104
Grain Products	102	102	103
Light Industry	102	105	100.2
Construction Materials Industry	105	105	101

The industry of all UNION REPUBLICS underwent further development. The growth rates and fulfillment of the output sales plan (including industry under union jurisdiction) were as follows:

	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985		Percentage Fulfillment of 9-Month Output Sales Plan
	Production Volume	Labor Productivity	
RSFSR	105.1	105.1	101
Ukrainian SSR	104.9	104.9	102
Belorussian SSR	107.2	106.7	102
Uzbek SSR	106.6	104.4	102
Kazakh SSR	106.4	105.1	102
Georgian SSR	104.7	103.8	102
Azerbaijan SSR	104.1	103.3	101
Lithuanian SSR	104.8	104.5	102
Moldavian SSR	106.7	105.4	102
Latvian SSR	104.1	104.3	102
Kirghiz SSR	105.1	103.6	102
Tajik SSR	101.7	99.9	103
Armenian SSR	105.1	103.4	102
Turkmen SSR	106.8	104.7	102
Estonian SSR	103.3	104.0	102

Production of the MOST IMPORTANT TYPES OF OUTPUT for the country as a whole was as follows:

	Produced in 1st 9 Months of 1986	1st 9 Months of 1986 As Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985	Percentage Fulfillment of 1986 9-Month Plan
FUEL AND ENERGY COMPLEX			
Electricity, billion kilowatt-hours	1,167	104	100.7
Petroleum, including gas condensate, million metric tons	458	103	99.4
Gas, billion cubic meters	506	107	102
Coal, million metric tons	562	104	102
METALLURGICAL COMPLEX			
Steel, million metric tons	120	105	102
Rolled ferrous metal products (finished), million metric tons	83.9	104	100.9
Steel pipes, million metric tons	14.8	103	100.5
Iron ore, million metric tons	187	101	101
MACHINE BUILDING COMPLEX			
Turbines, million kilowatts	14.4	100.9	98
Turbine generators, million kilowatts	10.4	95	109
AC electric motors, million kilowatts	41.7	103	99.6
Metal-cutting machine tools, million rubles	2,175	110	102
of which, with digital program control	962	126	110
Forging and pressing machines, million rubles	526	105	99
Industrial robots, thousands	11.1	120	110
Instruments, automation equipment, and spare parts, billion rubles	3.6	104	102
Computer equipment and spare parts, billion rubles	3.5	115	106
Petroleum apparatus, million rubles	190	110	100.5
Chemical equipment and spare parts, million rubles	738	104	99
Industrial equipment and spare parts for light and food industry, billion rubles	1.4	104	100.4

Tractors, million horsepower	40.9	104	100.5
Agricultural machines billion rubles	3.0	109	100.6
Machines and equipment for livestock raising and feed production, billion rubles	2.2	104	100.1
Grain harvesting combines, thousands	87.4	104	100.6
Cotton harvesting machines, thousands	6.8	97	100.6
Excavators, thousands	32.2	100.7	102
CHEMICAL AND TIMBER COMPLEX			
Mineral fertilizers (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent) million metric tons	25.8	105	98
Chemical plant protection agents (in 100-percent active ingredient equivalent), thousand metric tons	254	95	102
Sulfuric acid, million metric tons	20.5	107	100.3
Caustic soda, million metric tons	2.4	107	99
Chemical fibers and yarns million metric tons	1.1	107	100.9
Synthetic resins and plastics, million metric tons	4.0	107	98
Tires for motor vehicles, buses, agricultural machines, motorcycles, and motor scooters, millions	49.7	102	100.7
Commercial lumber (excluding kolkhoz timber procurements), million trimmed cubic meters	228	109	100
Paper, million metric tons	4.6	104	102
of which, newsprint, billion square meters	25.8	105	101
Cement, million tons	101	104	100.5
Precast ferroconcrete structures and items, million cubic meters	104	105	100.3
CONSUMER GOODS PRODUCTION			
Textiles, all types, billion square meters	9.1	102	100.4
Sewn goods, billion rubles	18.9	102	100.3
Knitted underwear and outerwear, billion items	1.3	103	100.6
Footwear, million pairs	590	102	100.4

Cultural and household goods and domestic appliances, billion rubles	44.3	106	100.5
Clocks and watches, millions	52.3	104	100.1
Chinaware and earthenware, million rubles	703	102	99.4
High-grade crockery (glass and crystal), million rubles	817	92	99.8
Radio receivers, millions	6.7	104	100.1
Television sets, millions	7.1	103	99
of which, color sets	3.2	109	98
Refrigerators and freezers, millions	4.5	102	100.1
of which, refrigerators with a capacity of 200 liters or more	2.8	115	100.9
Washington machines, millions	4.0	108	100.4
Automobiles, thousands	991	99.9	100.8
Motorcycles and motor scooters, thousands	850	99	100.2
Furniture, billion rubles	6.2	105	102

The 9-month plan was exceeded to the tune of 11 billion cubic meters of gas, 13 million metric tons of coal, 2.4 million metric tons of iron ore, 1.9 million metric tons of steel, 737,000 metric tons of finished rolled ferrous metal products, 68,000 metric tons of steel pipes, R35 million of metal-cutting machine tools, about 1,000 industrial robots, R248 million of instruments, automation equipment, and computer hardware, R19 million of agricultural machinery, 702 excavators, 4,400 metric tons of chemical plant protection agents, 66,000 metric tons of sulfuric acid, 10,000 metric tons of chemical fibers and yarns, 344,000 tires, 105,000 metric tons of paper, 492,000 metric tons of cement, and 285,000 cubic meters of precast ferroconcrete.

The targets for the production of many consumer goods were exceeded. Some 35 million square meters of textiles, 8 million items of knitted underwear and outerwear, 2.2 million pairs of footwear, 7,500 radio receivers, 5,200 refrigerators and freezers, R121 million of furniture, and a great deal of other output was produced over and above the plan.

At the same time the shortcomings in industry's work are being eliminated only slowly. Production associations and enterprises were responsible for delivery shortfalls of R6.4 billion against the contract and job schedule product lists. One enterprise in three violated contractual discipline. For industry as a whole the output sales plan was 98.7 percent fulfilled, taking deliveries into account. Associations and enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, Ministry of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, and Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry lagged considerably behind in fulfilling the deliveries plan. Fulfillment of the deliveries plan deteriorated by comparison with the same period last year in the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building, the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, and the Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Domestic Appliances.

The plan for oil extraction and the production of AC electric motors, chemical equipment, mineral fertilizers, caustic soda, synthetic resins and plastics, and color television sets was not fulfilled.

The overall results of industry's work were affected by the lag that emerged in September in the work of a number of sectors of the machine building and chemical and timber complexes.

The lack of rhythm in the work of a number of sectors, especially machine building, persists. For certain types of products in machine tool building and heavy, construction, and transport machine building over one-third of the monthly program is produced in the last days of the month, which results in a decline in output quality and creates difficulties in the work of transportation.

Many associations and enterprises make inefficient use of fixed capital.

In machine building metalworking equipment works for only a little over one shift [per day].

Some ministries and departments have lagged behind in assimilating newly commissioned and reconstructed capacities and have not fulfilled the targets for saving material resources and reducing prime cost. Almost one production association and enterprise in five did not fulfill the plan in terms of financial results.

III. Agro-Industrial Complex [subhead]

HARVESTING work is being completed in the agro-industrial complex, and the processing of agricultural output is under way.

As of 5 October, grain and pulse crops had been harvested from an area of 104.9 million hectares, or 95 percent of the sown area.

The harvesting of other agricultural crops is as follows (in millions of hectares):

	Harvested as of 5 October 1986	As Percentage of Sown Area	As Percentage of 8 October 1985
Sugar beets (industrial)	2.1	62	104
Sunflowers	3.0	76	124
Long-stemmed flax	0.9	92	104
Potatoes	2.6	92	103
Vegetables	0.9	65	100

Cotton-growing republics have begun harvesting the raw cotton.

Feed procurement is going rather better than last year. As of 5 October, expressed in feed unit equivalent, 128.7 million metric tons of food had been procured, which is 93 percent of the plan; last year 127.8 million metric tons had been procured by that date. Now 14.9 quintals of feed units have been laid in per standard head of cattle, as against 14.7 quintals last year. The farms of the Uzbek SSR; the Moldavian SSR; Rostov and Penza Oblasts; the Mary, Mordovian, Kalmyk, and Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republics; and Maritime Kray are lagging considerably behind the feed procurement plan.

Work to ensure the 1987 harvest is being carried out at a higher pace. Winter crops have been sown in 33.6 million hectares. The plan for the sowing of winter crops has been 86 percent fulfilled.

Fall plowing has been carried out on 75.2 million hectares, which is 7.6 million hectares more than last year.

STATE PURCHASES of grain, especially strong and durum wheat, increased. The grain sales plan has been fulfilled by the kolkhozes of 85 oblasts (krays, or autonomous republics) of the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Belorussian SSR, the Kazakh SSR, the Uzbek SSR, the Kirghiz SSR, the Azerbaijan SSR, the Georgian SSR, and the Turkmen SSR.

Figures for purchases of potatoes, vegetables, fruits, and berries in the country are cited below (in millions of metric tons):

	Purchased as of 5 October 1986	Percentage Fulfillment of Annual Plan
Potatoes	14.0	77
Vegetables	12.9	63
Fruits and berries (as of 22 September)	2.3	38

In the country as a whole 2.5 million metric tons (or 21 percent) more potatoes, 461,000 metric tons (or 4 percent) more vegetables, and 237,000 metric tons (or 12 percent) more fruits and berries have been purchased than over the corresponding period last year. At the same time potato purchases are down in the Armenian, Azerbaijan, Georgian, Kazakh, Kirghiz, Tajik, Ukrainian, and Moldavian SSR's, vegetable purchases are down in the Armenian, Turkmen, Azerbaijan, Latvian, Kirghiz, and Tajik SSR's, and fruit and berry purchases are down in the Ukrainian, Uzbek, and Georgian SSR's.

The sale of crop-growing produce to the state continues.

The proportion of output sold in kolkhoz markets and consumer cooperatives toward the planned volume of purchases is still low.

In agricultural enterprises meat and egg production increased 7 percent and milk production increased 5 percent by comparison with the same period last year. The increase in output has been achieved largely by improving livestock and poultry productivity. The average milk yield per cow increased by 6 percent, the average daily weight gain for cattle and hogs increased by 3 and 5 percent respectively, and the average egg yield of hens increased by 4 percent. More young animals were obtained and the safekeeping of animals improved.

The LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY POPULATION on kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and interfarm enterprises totaled (in millions of head):

	As of 1 October	
	1985	1986
Cattle	96.4	96.5
of which, cows	29.4	29.1
Pigs	60.3	63.1
Sheep and goats	121.0	124.0
Poultry	777.1	776.2

STATE PURCHASES OF LIVESTOCK PRODUCTS from all categories of farms are as follows:

	1st 9 Months 1986	1986 as Percentage of 1985	Percentage Fulfillment of 1986 9-Month Plan
Livestock and poultry (live weight), million metric tons	14.8	107.6	108.3
Milk, million metric tons	58.2	104.5	104.7
Eggs, billions	41.2	105.6	109.8

The 9-month plan for purchases of livestock, poultry, milk, and eggs was fulfilled by all union republics except the Uzbek and Estonian SSR's, which failed to fulfill the plan for milk purchases.

Working people in the FOOD SECTORS of the agro-industrial complex largely secured the planned volumes of output of food products.

Production of the most important types of food industry output in the country as a whole was as follows:

	Produced in 1st 9 Months of 1986	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985	Percentage Fulfillment of 1986 9-Month Plan
Meat (industrial output), million metric tons	8.4	107	106
Sausage products, million metric tons	2.6	104	102
Edible fish products, including canned fish, million metric tons	4.2	102	104
Animal oil, million metric tons	1.4	105	104
Wholemilk products in milk equivalent, million metric tons	23.3	105	105
Margarine products, million metric tons	1.0	104	99
Vegetable oil, million metric tons	1.9	119	95
Confectionery, million metric tons	3.2	104	102
Canned goods, billion standard cans	14.8	110	105
of which, canned fruits and vegetables	10.6	114	105
Mineral waters, million decaliters	114	113	101
Nonalcoholic drinks, million decaliters	430	137	88

There is a decline in production of liqueurs, vodkas, and wine products, production of which showed a 35 percent decrease compared with the first 9 months of last year.

The MATERIAL AND TECHNICAL BASE OF THE AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX is strengthening. The plan for deliveries of tractors, trucks, the main types of agricultural machines, and chemical feed additives was fulfilled.

Some 291,000 tractors, 86,000 grain harvesting, 31,000 silage harvesting and feed harvesting, 2,000 corn harvesting, and 6,000 potato harvesting combines, 5,000 beet harvesting and 7,000 cotton harvesting machines, 18,000 sprinkler machines and units, and 69,000 machines to apply mineral and solid organic fertilizers were delivered to agriculture.

The delivery of mineral fertilizers (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent) to agriculture was 19.4 million metric tons, or 0.9 million metric tons more than in the corresponding period last year, and the delivery of chemical feed additives was 772,000 metric tons, or 65,000 metric tons more.

State CAPITAL INVESTMENTS toward developing the sectors ensuring fulfillment of the USSR Food Program totaled over R29 billion.

These funds were used to construct livestock accommodation and mechanized livestock units and complexes to house 0.9 million livestock and 1.2 million poultry, poultry units to produce 20 million meat birds per year, hay storehouses to hold 1 million metric tons at any one time, silage and cured hay installations with a capacity of 4.4 million cubic meters, and other projects.

About 1 million hectares of irrigated and drained land were commissioned.

Capacities for the production of meat, cheese, wholemilk products, granulated sugar, confectionery, canned fruits and vegetables, machines and equipment for livestock raising and feed production, mineral fertilizers and chemical feed additives, elevators, and milling and mixed feed enterprises were commissioned.

Many storehouses for potatoes, vegetables, and fruits were commissioned.

IV. Transport and Communications [subhead]

Freight shipments and passenger turnover on individual types of transportation were as follows:

	Performed in 1st 9 Months of 1986 1985	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985	Percentage Fulfillment of 1986 9-Month Plan
FREIGHT SHIPMENTS million metric tons			
Railroad transportation	3,052	104	103
Maritime transportation	189	106	
including on coastal voyages	65.86	102	107
General-purpose river transportation	553	104	104
General-purpose automotive transportation	5,021	106	102
Oil and oil product pipelines	487	103	100.2
PASSENGER TURNOVER, billion passenger-km			
Railroad transportation	302	104	104

General-purpose automotive transportation	348	104	102
Air transportation	153	104	102

Freight turnover on all types of transportation increased by 5.3 percent.

During the 9 months on RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION the plan for shipments of all the main freight except timber and refractory materials was fulfilled. About 80 million metric tons of freight was transported over and above the plan, including 14 million metric tons of hard coal, 3 million metric tons of petroleum and petroleum products, 8 million metric tons of iron and manganese ore, and 5 million metric tons of ferrous metals and other most important freight.

The target for reducing the prime cost of shipments was fulfilled. Labor productivity increased 8.2 percent over the corresponding period last year, as against the planned 2.1 percent. The entire increase in shipments was achieved by means of increased labor productivity. All railroads coped with the freight loading plan. The utilization of rolling stock improved.

Railroads operating under the new conditions of economic management and economic experiment fulfilled the loading plan 101.9 percent, and the remaining railroads fulfilled it 101.3 percent.

At the same time certain railroads failed to cope with the targets for the shipment of a number of most important types of freight: timber in the case of the Sverdlovsk, Gorkiy, Oktyabrskaya, Krasnoyarsk, and East Siberian Railroads, refractory materials in the case of the Donetsk, Southeast, Sverdlovsk, and Oktyabrskaya Railroads, petroleum and petroleum products in the case of the Kuybyshev and Volga Railroads, and mineral fertilizers in the case of the Sverdlovsk and Gorkiy Railroads. In many cases the loading plans were not fulfilled through the fault of the dispatching enterprises.

The shortcomings in passenger service are being eliminated only slowly and there are many instances of late trains. Losses of freight en route and other unproductive expenditure are still considerable. The exceeding of the norms for freight car idle time on enterprise spur tracks and the absence of efficient organization of loading and unloading work and of proper safekeeping of the freight car pool result in a decline in loading resources.

MARITIME TRANSPORTATION fulfilled the plan for freight transportation on foreign voyages; it increased by 5 percent.

The Black Sea, Baltic, and Latvian Steamship Companies, which are working under the new economic management conditions, overfulfilled the freight dispatch plans by 11, 18, and 8 percent respectively.

RIVER TRANSPORTATION exceeded the targets for passenger dispatch and passenger turnover. The RSFSR Ministry of the River Fleet, the Belorussian SSR Main Administration of the River Fleet, and the Estonian SSR river transportation failed to fulfill the plan for freight turnover.

Enterprises of the RSFSR Ministry of the River Fleet working under the new economic management conditions dispatched 19 million metric tons of freight, or 4 percent more than planned.

The volume of passenger transportation on MOTOR VEHICLE TRANSPORTATION increased by 4 percent.

Motor transport enterprises of the Belorussian SSR, Kazakh SSR, and Georgian SSR Ministries of Motor Transport, the Latvian SSR Ministry of Motor Transport and Highways, and the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Administration for Motor Transport, which have been switched to the new conditions of economic management, fulfilled the freight shipment plan 104 percent; shipments increased 4 percent compared with the corresponding period last year.

Enterprises of the Uzbek SSR, Tajik SSR, and Moldavian SSR Ministries of Motor Transport and the Estonian SSR Ministry of Motor Transport and Highways fulfilled the freight shipment plan 83, 98, 98, and 96 percent respectively.

Ministry of the Gas Industry GAS PIPELINES fulfilled the plan for the supply of commodity gas.

AIR TRANSPORTATION carried over 90 million passengers. The plans for the total volume of shipments and chemical spraying work in agriculture and forestry were fulfilled, and the target for serving sectors of the national economy was met.

COMMUNICATIONS ENTERPRISES fulfilled the income plan; it increased 6 percent compared with the corresponding period last year.

V. Capital Construction [subhead]

The commissioning of FIXED CAPITAL from state capital investments totaled R78.5 billion, or 83 percent of the 9-month plan. Some R115.2 billion of state CAPITAL INVESTMENTS were assimilated. Some 94 percent of the capital investment quota established for this period was utilized.

Plan fulfillment and the growth rate in the commissioning of fixed capital and state capital investments for ministries are as follows:

	All-union and Union Republic Ministries and Departments		Commissioning of Fixed Capital	State Capital Investments
	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985	Percentage Fulfillment of 1986 9-Month Plan	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985	Percentage of 1986 9-Month Plan
FUEL AND ENERGY COMPLEX				
Power and Electrification	87	63	107	86
Petroleum Industry	126	82	119	95
Gas Industry	102	90	107	113
Coal Industry	123	80	108	90
METALLURGICAL COMPLEX				
Ferrous Metallurgy	109	88	116	89
Nonferrous Metallurgy	104	82	109	93
MACHINE BUILDING COMPLEX				
Power Machine Building	126	68	92	85
Heavy and Transport Machine Building	119	62	112	89

Electrical Equipment Industry	99	68	105	84
Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building	92	62	122	76
Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry	112	67	121	84
Instrument Making Automation Equipment and Control Systems	137	94	135	90
Automotive Industry	119	88	119	103
Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building	120	70	121	88
Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production	93	47	91	80
Construction, Road and Municipal Machine Building	127	87	116	86
Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Domestic Appliances	118	73	116	84
CHEMICAL AND TIMBER COMPLEX				
Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry	107	68	109	85
Chemical Industry	141	69	114	78
Production of Mineral Fertilizers	169	66	92	86
Medical and Microbiological Industry	82	71	107	75
Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry	112	93	106	86
AGRO-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX				
State Agro-Industrial Committee	112	81	106	103
Fish Industry	101	93	105	98
Grain Products	92	83	106	96
Land Reclamation and Water Resources	110	86	105	99
Light Industry	83	84	105	92
Construction Materials Industry	120	84	113	82

Capital investments in the development of the machine building complex, which ensures the retooling of the country's production apparatus, increased 17 percent in comparison with the corresponding period of last year.

The third turbine at the Surgut GRES-2 in Tyumen Oblast, second turbines at the Tam-kumyrskaya GES in the Kirghiz SSR and the Miatlinskaya GES in the Dagestan SSR, and new turbines at a number of other power stations were commissioned.

Capacities were commissioned for extracting coal at the "Azeyskiy" and "Angrenskiy" open-cut pits in Irkutsk and Tashkent Oblasts respectively and for producing steel at the L.I. Brezhnev Electrometallurgical Combine in Oskol, cold-rolled sheet metal at the Yu.V. Andropov Metallurgical Combine in Novolipetsk, and synthetic ammonia at the "Tolyattiazot" Production Association. Capacities increased in machine building, the construction materials industry, and consumer goods production.

However the January-September plan for COMMISSIONING PROJECTS on the State Plan itemized list was fulfilled by 49 percent. The USSR Ministries of Power and Electrification, the Ministries of the Petroleum and Gas Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, the Ministry of Railways, the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, and others failed to commission a considerable number of important production projects.

The plan was fulfilled for the COMMISSIONING OF MOST IMPORTANT CAPACITIES for the catalytic reforming of raw material and the production of cast iron, cable products, metal cutting machine tools, forging and pressing machinery, calcined soda, sheet fiber board, asbestos cement board, sewn goods, knitted fabrics, and new railroad lines. At the same time considerable shortfalls occurred in the fulfillment of the 9-month targets for the commissioning of turbine power station capacities and the production of large-scale electrical machines, instruments for controlling and regulating manufacturing processes, roller bearings, synthetic ammonia, synthetic resins and plastics, tires for motor vehicles and agricultural machinery, timber materials, leather footwear, furniture, and a number of other products. The target for the commissioning of main gas and oil pipelines and electrified sections of railroad was not fulfilled.

The VOLUME OF CONTRACT WORK carried out by construction and installation organizations increased 7 percent and labor productivity rose 4.5 percent.

For ministries in the construction complex the volume of contract work increased 7 percent and labor productivity rose 4.9 percent. Fulfillment of the prescribed volume of contract work amounted to 99.5 percent. The Ministry of Transport Construction and USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work coped successfully with the plan. The plan was not fulfilled by the USSR Ministry of Construction in Northern and Western Areas, the USSR Ministry of Construction in Southern Areas, the USSR Ministry of Construction in Areas of the Urals and Western Siberia, and the USSR Ministry of Construction in Eastern Areas and by union republic ministries of construction as a whole.

The Ministry of Construction of Petroleum and Gas Industry Enterprises and the USSR Ministry of Reclamation and Water Resources recorded an above-plan volume of contract work. The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification did not fulfill the prescribed volume of contract work.

Construction ministries failed to concentrate material and technical resources on projects scheduled for commissioning, which was one of the reasons for the nonfulfillment of the commissioning plan. The level of plan target fulfillment is lower for projects scheduled for commissioning than for all projects as a whole.

More than one-fourth of contract construction and installation organizations failed to cope with the profit plan.

Despite higher labor productivity growth rates in comparison with the first 9 months of last year, they have been declining in recent months.

VI. Social Development and Raising the People's Living Standard [subhead]

The program for social development and raising the people's prosperity adopted by the 27th CPSU Congress is being implemented on the basis of the growth of the economy.

NATIONAL INCOME used for consumption and accumulation increased 3.7 percent.

The NUMBER OF WORKERS AND EMPLOYEES averaged in excess of 118 million over the 9 months.

WAGES INCREASED. The average monthly money wage of workers and employees in the national economy totaled R194 as against R189 in the corresponding period last year. Kolkhoz members' earnings increased 4 percent.

The raising of wage and salary rates for middle and senior grade teachers, lecturers, masters of production training, and leading and other pedagogical workers in general educational schools, secondary specialized and vocational and technical educational establishments, and interschool production training combines for the labor instruction and vocational orientation of students in all parts of the country was completed.

Work begun in the first half of 1986 to improve the labor remuneration of workers at a number of sector scientific research institutes, designers and technologists in industry, and certain other categories of workers is being carried out. These measures are being effected out of funds earned by labor collectives.

The struggle against unearned income is being stepped up alongside the improvement of labor remuneration and its organization.

The population received PAYMENTS AND BENEFITS from social consumption funds totaling R115 billion, R4.5 billion more than during the corresponding period last year. Wages of workers and employees taking these payments and benefits into account totaled R271 per month.

There was an increase in monthly state allowances for the children of regular servicemen and in pensions for pensioners linked with agriculture living in rural localities. Other measures were implemented to increase payments and benefits to the population from social consumption funds.

Working people's savings bank deposits increased by more than R11 billion over the 9 months.

The volume of RETAIL TRADE TURNOVER in state and cooperative trade totaled R245.9 billion and increased R15.2 billion in comparable prices in comparison with the first 9 months of 1985.

The retail trade turnover plan for the country as a whole was fulfilled. At the same time the plan was not fulfilled in the Belorussian SSR, the Georgian SSR, the Azerbaijan SSR, the Armenian SSR, and the Turkmen SSR.

The GROWTH IN THE SALE OF INDIVIDUAL COMMODITIES in state and cooperative trade is reflected in the following figures:

	1st 9 Months of 1986 as Percentage of 1st 9 Months of 1985
Grain products	100
Meat and meat products	103
Fish and fish products	105
Animal oils	103
Vegetable oils	107
Margarine products	104
Wholemilk products	105
Cheese	105
Eggs	104
Sugar	109
Confectionery	108
Tea	112
Potatoes	110
Vegetables	105
Citrus and other fruit	115
Nonalcoholic beverages	128
Mineral water	123
Fruit and vegetable juices	148
Alcoholic beverages	62
Clothing, underwear, and textiles	104
Knitwear products	107
Hosiery products	109
Footwear	110
Chinaware, earthenware, and glassware	100
Soap and synthetic detergents	106
Furniture	110
Refrigerators and freezers of which, those with a capacity of 200 liters and more	116
Washing machines	110
Electric vacuum cleaners	109
Clocks and watches	98
Photographic cameras	98
Radio receivers	95
Television sets of which, color sets	115
Tape recorders	109
Bicycles and mopeds	108
Motorcycles and motor scooters	107
Automobiles	95
Timber	115
Slates	114
Roofing sheet steel and other metal products	125

With the intensive development of collective horticulture and truck gardening there is an increased demand from the population for timber and construction materials. The demand for many of them is not being fully satisfied, however, and the 9-month plan for supplies to the trade system was not fulfilled.

The annual target for the sale of local construction materials to the population was fulfilled by 30 percent over the 9 months, but by only 10-25 percent in the Kazakh SSR, the RSFSR, the Georgian SSR, and the Tajik SSR, while the target for the sale of ferroconcrete products and structures was fulfilled by 70 percent, but by only 10 percent in the Georgian SSR, the Azerbaijan SSR, and the Armenian SSR.

The implementation of measures to reduce the sale of alcoholic beverages continued, and the population's expenditure on purchasing them fell by R8.5 billion. The decline in the consumption of alcoholic beverages is promoting a general improvement in the situation in the country -- there has been a decline in absence from work, road accidents, and injuries in the home and a sharp reduction (by 24 percent) in deaths among the population resulting from accidents.

At the same time a number of republics' councils of ministers are not taking the requisite steps to convert wineries to the production of other products, realize all opportunities for increasing production of consumer goods and services, and ensure balance between the population's money incomes and expenditure on this basis.

In accordance with the Comprehensive Program for the Development of Consumer Goods Production and the Services Sphere the population was provided with paid services worth R37 billion, including R8 billion of consumer services. The volume of consumer services increased 7.3 percent as against an annual plan figure of 6.7 percent, and their growth in rural localities was above the average. Enterprises of the Uzbek SSR, Georgian SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, and Tajik SSR Ministries of Consumer Services failed to cope with the plan.

Despite the increase in trade turnover and services the population's increasing demand for some of them was not fully satisfied, and the quality of many goods and services continues to fall short of requirements.

Light industry's performance deteriorated. The proportion of particularly fashionable items is low. They account for less than 2 percent of the USSR Ministry of Light Industry's total production. Some 8-10 percent of the clothing, footwear, and textiles produced by this ministry's enterprises is regularly scrapped or downgraded.

For a long time there has been no improvement in the quality of output from the Kutaisi and Leninakan Sewn Goods Production Associations and the Volodarskiy Sewn Goods Factory in Baku, where 30-50 percent of the checked quantity of clothing produced was scrapped in 1981-1986; and 13-20 percent of the footwear produced by the Tashkent, Kuznetsk, and Baku No. 1 footwear factories and the Irkutsk and Frunze Production Associations was substandard.

Low-quality color television sets are produced by the Omsk and Shyaylyay Television Plants and the 50-Letiye Kompartii Belorussia Radio Plant in Minsk; and low-quality radio receivers are produced by the 50-Letiye Oktyabrya Production Association in Lvov and the "Punane-Ret" Association in Estonia. The Samarkand and Dushanbe plants also produce domestic refrigerators of unsatisfactory quality.

The scale of HOUSING CONSTRUCTION increased. State capital investments alone accounted for the commissioning of 50.5 million square meters of total housing, 4.9 million square meters more than the corresponding period last year. The housing commissioning plan for the country as a whole was not fulfilled, however, The RSFSR, the Uzbek SSR, the Lithuanian SSR, the Moldavian SSR, the Latvian SSR, the Estonian SSR, and also the Ministries of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building, the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, Power Machine Building, Transport Construction, the Means of Communication Industry, and a number of others failed to cope with the target.

General educational schools for 935,000 pupils, preschool establishments for 272,000 children, hospitals with 25,000 beds, and out-patient clinics catering for 59,000 consultations per shift were commissioned out of state capital investments. The commissioning of general educational schools scheduled for commissioning by the beginning of the academic year was not ensured. The 9-month plan for the commissioning of preschool establishments, hospitals, and out-patient clinics was not fulfilled. The biggest shortfall against the plan targets for the construction of such facilities was recorded in the RSFSR, the Uzbek SSR, and the Moldavian SSR.

As of 1 September 91 percent of the total local soviet housing stock was ready for winter. A low level of housing stock readiness was recorded in the Kirghiz SSR (49 percent), and the Azerbaijan SSR (68 percent).

Measures were carried out to reduce urban atmospheric pollution and the discharge of effluent into water sources and to increase water recycling, which made it possible to save more than 1 million cubic meters of fresh water a day in the first half-year alone.

The general educational and vocational school REFORM is being consistently implemented.

At the beginning of the 1986-1987 academic year there were 43.5 million students in general educational schools; 5.5 million of them were first-time schoolchildren, 1 in 5 being 6 years of age. There are 4.5 million people studying at secondary specialized educational establishments and 5.2 million at VUZ's. Some 2.6 million people have been admitted to vocational and technical educational establishments.

The POPULATION of the Soviet Union on 1 October 1986 totaled 280.9 million.

PRAVDA REVIEWS CURRENT HARVEST, LIVESTOCK SITUATION

PM101408 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 86 First Edition p 2

[Ye. Yevgenyev "Agricultural Review": "Until the Next Hard Slog"]

[Text] The USSR Central Statistical Administration reports that by 5 October grain and pulse crops (excluding corn) had been cut on 105.8 million hectares on the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and grain crops had been threshed on 104.9 million hectares. Corn, sugar beets, and potatoes have been harvested on 94, 62, and 92 percent of the areas respectively. Sunflower threshing, flax pulling, and vegetable harvesting are being completed. Sowing of winter crops is continuing in southern regions, and fall plowing is being carried out everywhere. These jobs have been carried out by 86 and 67 percent respectively.

The fields are cooling down after the intensity of harvest work. Harvesting is drawing to an end. Farmers are summing up the competition results and analyzing the pluses and minuses of the year. Many collectives acted energetically and without delay. Wide use of intensive technologies and of the new economic machinery of management has had a beneficial effect on all aspects of farm labor. There has been an appreciable increase in the grainfields' yields per hectare. Grain growers in the Kuban, in Stavropol and Altay Krays, in a number of Ukrainian oblasts, and in North Kazakhstan have had gratifying successes. The grain quality has improved. More strong and valuable wheats have been procured than last year. Many farms have already fulfilled their pledges for grain sales to the state.

Vegetable and potato deliveries are proceeding more successfully than last year. Farms have fulfilled the plans for their handover by 63 and 77 percent respectively.

Trucks are now running shuttle services between the fields and the plants with sugar beets. Some 25.4 million metric tons of roots have been delivered to procurement centers -- 31 percent of the planned volume. This is somewhat more than last year.

The harvest that has been grown, rational methods of delivering and processing it, and the struggle against losses are creating good preconditions for increasing sugar production now. It is important to prevent an interval between lifting and transporting the roots and to preserve the harvest skillfully until it has been fully processed.

Cotton growers have worked under complex conditions of a water shortage. The majority of farms promise to give the motherland no less raw cotton than last year. In order to enhance the interest in producing high-quality output, it has now become a widespread practice to receive and pay for raw cotton depending on its merits and its fiber content. Azerbaijan farms are leading in the cotton growers' competition. They have handed over to the state four-fifths of the planned volume of raw cotton. In all, 2.5 million metric tons of cotton -- 27 percent of the target -- had reached procurement centers by the beginning of October.

By tradition, with the arrival of the stabling period, more and more livestock unit collectives join in the all-union socialist competition for successful wintering and increased production.

Reserves for acceleration are being sought, and the experience and initiative of foremost workers are being adopted. By the beginning of October kolkhozes and sovkhozes had increased livestock and poultry procurements by 8 percent and milk procurements by 4.5 percent, compared with the same period last year. It is very important now to prevent a slump in the animals' productivity. Unfortunately, not all farms have succeeded in this. Milk yields have fallen in Bryansk, Tula, and a number of other oblasts.

During the first days of October the stock of coarse and succulent feed exceeded last year's level. However, less forage than is required has been accumulated in a number of rayons. Consequently, it is necessary to seek out and make better use of all sources for replenishing it. Large areas of feed root crops have to be harvested, and the crop is a very good one this year. Thriftily dealing with it, entering its receipts, and preserving it means obtaining considerable additional livestock products.

A lot of straw has been left in the fields in Siberia and Kazakhstan following the harvesting of grain crops. There is also a considerable reserve. It is still possible to increase stocks of combined silage. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have sufficient raw materials for this -- beets, potatoes, corn cobs, aftergrass.

It is no less important to use forage resources most efficiently. And this, as practice shows, is possible if feed shops and mixed feed enterprises work well. Their readiness in the country as a whole is higher now than it was last year. At the same time, in Uzbekistan, for example, one farm in every three does not have a feed shop. Orenburg Oblast livestock units are poorly equipped with them. Specialists of engineering and zootechnical services of farms and rayon agro-industrial associations must seek and widely use feed preparation methods without expending energy or with its minimal expenditure.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 19-21 OCT REPORTED

LD230207 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 19-22 October 1986. GMT times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

No fileworthy reports monitored for 19 October.

20 October

Kiev Oblast farm workers have completed sales of grain to the state. Over 550,000 metric tons of grain has been poured into state granaries. For the first time about 66,000 metric tons of valuable wheat strains have been delivered to procurement points.

Also Astrakhan farmers have fulfilled ahead of schedule the sale of rice to the state. Over 100,000 metric tons have been sent to procurement points. (Moscow Television Service in Russian, 1130)

Krasnodar Kray agricultural workers today completed the sowing of winter crops. This year the whole area occupied by winter grains -- more than 1.6 million hectares -- will be cultivate by intensive technology. (1200)

The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of Stavropol Oblast today completed the mass sowing of winter grain crops. The area of intensive cultivation of the main crop, wheat, has been increased to 950,000 hectares. (1200)

Winter feed is being laid in: 200,000 metric tons of hay and aobut 630,000 metric tons of hay and about 630,000 metric tons of haylage so far, and the quality is much better than last year, in part owing to new methods involving joint sowing of soya and corn. (1430)

21 October

Tselinograd Oblast has completed autumn plowing; work has been carried out on almost 2.5 million hectares. (0100)

The annual plan for the sale of grain has been fulfilled by farms in Kurgan Oblast: 1.35 million metric tons of grain have been poured into state granaries. The delivery of grain continues. (0700)

State granaries in Khmelnitskiy Oblast contain 890,000 metric tons of grain, which is 111 percent of the plan. (0800)

In Krasnodar Kray threshing of rice is being completed on the last hundreds of hectares. Kuban produces one-third of the whole of the country's rice crop. A high yild has been achieved this year. A second threshing has yet to be carried out. This method will appreciably increase the overall gross yield of the crop. Machine operators have yet to carry this out because of inadequate combine harvesters. (1200)

More than 1.5 million metric tons of grain have been procured in Omsk Oblast. The state plan has been fulfilled but procurement continues. About 550,000 metric tons of strong wheat have been procured so far. (1400)

Sugar beet producers of Orel Oblast have had their best result for 10 years: they have delivered 1.038 million metric tons of beet, or 170,000 metric tons more than was planned. At the same time, they are completing autumn work on future sugar beet plantations. (1600)

BRIEFS

AZERBAIJAN COTTON HARVEST -- The Central Statistics Adminitration of the Azerbaijan SSR has disclosed that the republic's cotton farmers fulfilled their annual harvest plan on 13 October, providing 714,000 tons of cotton for sale to the state. Fulfillment was 100.7 percent. [Summary] [Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 14 Oct 86 NC]